



Greeks and Barbarians

*Essays on the Interactions between
Greeks and Non-Greeks in Antiquity
and the Consequences for Eurocentrism*

edited by

John E. Coleman
and
Clark A. Walz

CDL Press
Bethesda, Maryland
1997

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Greeks and barbarians : essays on the interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks in antiquity and the consequences for Eurocentrism / edited by John E. Coleman and Clark A. Walz.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 1-883053-44-7

1. Greece--Civilization. 2. Europe--Civilization--Greek influences. 3. Eurocentrism--Greek influences. I. Coleman, John E., 1940- II. Walz, Clark A.

DE77.G7935 1997

949.5--dc21

97-40631

CIP

Copyright 1997. All rights reserved. This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that copying permitted in Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publisher, CDE Press, P.O. Box 34454, Bethesda, Md. 20827.

OCCASIONAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF NEAR EASTERN STUDIES
AND THE
PROGRAM OF JEWISH STUDIES
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

NUMBER 4

Edited by

Ross Brann

and

David I. Owen

Editorial Committee

Ross Brann,

David I. Owen,

Gary A. Rendsburg

- Vol. 1 *A Witness Forever: Ancient Israel's Perception of Literature and the Resistant Hebrew Bible* by Isaac Rabinowitz
- Vol. 2 *Yours Always: A Holocaust Love Story* by Kitty Silversmit
- Vol. 3 *Languages of Power in Islamic Spain* edited by Ross Brann
- Vol. 4 *Greeks and Barbarians: Essays on the Interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks in Antiquity and the Consequences for Eurocentrism* edited by John E. Coleman and Clark A. Walz

Contents

Preface

ix

Abbreviations

xvii

CLARK A. WALZ

Black Athena and the Role of Cyprus in
Near Eastern/Mycenaean Contact

1

ROGER D. WOODARD

Linguistic Connections between Greeks and Non-Greeks

29

MARTIN BERNAL

Linguistic Contacts around the Eastern Mediterranean
during the Bronze Age

61

GEORGE F. BASS

Beneath the Wine Dark Sea:
Nautical Archaeology and the Phoenicians of the *Odyssey*

71

FRANK M. SNOWDEN, JR.

Greeks and Ethiopians

103

ELEANOR GURALNICK	
The Egyptian-Greek Connection in the 8th to 6th Centuries B.C.: An Overview	127
ANTHONY PREUS	
Greek Philosophy in Egypt: From Solon to the Arab Conquest	155
JOHN E. COLEMAN	
Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism	175
SUSAN I. ROTROFF	
The Greeks and the Other in the Age of Alexander	221
MARY R. LEFKOWITZ	
Some Ancient Advocates of Greek Cultural Dependency	237
DIRK T.D. HELD	
Shaping Eurocentrism: The Uses of Greek Antiquity	255
GAIL HOLST-WARHAFT	
Great Expectations: The Burden of Philhellenism and Myths of Greek Nationalism	273
LAURA M. PURDY	
What We Shouldn't Be Learning from the Greeks	291
Addresses of Contributors	311

Preface

THE THIRTEEN CONTRIBUTIONS to this book are revised and expanded versions of papers originally read at a conference entitled "Greeks and Barbarians: The Classical Origins of Eurocentrism" held at Cornell University on April 23-25, 1993. Many focus on interpretations of the relationships between the ancient Greeks and the other cultures with which they came into contact, whether from the point of view of archaeology, history, linguistics, philosophy, or literature. Others are concerned with the legacy of Greek attitudes within the larger context of "Western civilization." Some essays deal with Greek relationships with specific peoples, such as the Phoenicians (Bass) and "Ethiopians," or African blacks (Snowden). Others take a sweeping view of Greek relationships and attitudes, such as the relationship between Greek and Egyptian philosophy (Preus). The broad aim of the book is to stimulate discussion of the importance of Greek thought for European attitudes toward non-Europeans and for recent debates about "multiculturalism."

Few "Western" thinkers have questioned the ancient Greek view that their civilization was vastly superior to that of other ancient peoples. A problem lies, however, in assessing the extent of the genuinely positive achievements of the Greeks, such as their concepts of democracy and justice, in the light of the less positive aspects of their culture, such as slavery and the subordination of women. Ethnocentrism poses some of the most difficult questions of judgment. The antithesis between Greeks and "barbarians," which became central to Greek self-definition, was taken in antiquity and later to represent the difference between civilization and chaos, freedom and slavery, self-control and self-abandonment, intelligence and stupidity, "us" and "them." The usage and significance of the term "barbarian" (*βάρβαρος*) is further discussed in Coleman's contribution to this volume.

Full understanding and appreciation of the successes and influence of ancient Greek civilization require that we consider all its aspects. Detailed studies of Greek relations with foreigners in the past have made many fundamental contributions to our knowledge, even when they tended to take a primarily descriptive, and therefore "neutral," interpretive stance. Such works include Julius Jüthner's *Hellenen und Barbaren* (Leipzig, 1923), Aubrey Diller's *Race Mixture among the Greeks before Alexander* (Urbana, University of Illinois, 1937), and the papers collected under the title *Greco et barbaros* (Geneva, Fondation Hardt, 1962). Among recent works that have taken a more questioning stance of the underlying assumptions of Greek ethnocentrism and its legacy are: T. J. Haarhof's *The Stranger at the Gates* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1948), which, among other things, deplores the militarism that is such an important part of Greek self-definition; Edith Hall's *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989), which exposes the Greek use of powerful stereotypes of "the other" in drama; and W. Burkert's *The Orientalizing Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, Harvard University Press, 1992), which emphasizes "Eastern" contributions to Greek civilization. Martin Bernal's *Black Athena I and II* (New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1987 and 1991), especially Volume I (*The Fabrication of Ancient Greece, 1785-1985*), have also helped to create a critical atmosphere by demonstrating and analyzing the existence of racist attitudes among nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars, although his work has been highly criticized (e.g., the many contributions in M. R. Lefkowitz and G. R. Rogers, *Black Athena Revisited*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press). The contributions to two colloquia entitled *L'Etranger dans le Monde Grecque* (edited by R. Lonis, Presses universitaires de Nancy: I, 1988; II, 1991) are mainly concerned with relationships among Greeks, although they cover much material of wider interest. Paul Cartledge's *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993) provides a sensitive discussion of many of the aspects of Greek thought treated by contributors to this volume. Pericles Georges' *Barbarian Asia and the Greek Experience* (Baltimore and London, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994) has also done much to untangle Greek attitudes towards the native peoples of Asia Minor and the Persians.

The book is subtitled "Essays on the Interactions between Greeks and Non-Greeks in Antiquity and the Consequences for Eurocentrism." Our use of the term "eurocentrism" is intended to draw attention to the

wider questions and, in particular, the contributions of Held, Holst-Warhaft, and Purdy, which deal with the continuation and revival of Greek attitudes towards foreigners in Europe in enlightenment and later times. "Eurocentric," the related adjective, is defined by *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, Third Edition (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1992) as: "Centered or focused on Europe and the Europeans." As Hellenism was from ancient times contrasted with and regarded as the antithesis of barbarism, so Eurocentrism is sometimes contrasted with Afrocentrism, although, like Hellenism, its implications encompass European attitudes to all other peoples.

The concepts of Europe and Europeans have gone through much change since antiquity. The Greeks divided as much of the world as they knew into three parts, Europe, Asia, and Libya (i.e., the African continent—the name "Africa" is from the Romans). For them, Europe was primarily a geographic term and they regarded its other inhabitants as barbarians. The Romans adopted both the geographical term "Europe" and the word "barbarian," which they used to refer to those beyond the boundaries of their empire (see, for example, A. N. Sherwin-White, *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome*, Cambridge, 1967; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Romans and Aliens*, Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1979). However, although the defining character of such outsiders was that they were uncivilized, the Romans, unlike the Greeks, allowed for integration of barbarians into their civilization through the expansion of Roman citizenship.

With the decline of the Roman empire and the extension of Christianity over much of the Mediterranean region and Europe, biblical geographic concepts came to overlie those of the Classical world. In particular, the continents were roughly equated with the territories occupied by the descendants of Shem, Ham, and Japhet, the sons of Noah (*Genesis* 9, 10; see D. Hay, *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1957, 8-15). The territory of Japhet was generally equated with Europe, which, in turn, came eventually to be identified by western Europeans with Christendom.

During the medieval period, the term "Europe" occurs from time to time (once even "European"). The concept of Europe provided a convenient distinction that could be used to help counter the threats to western Europe posed by the Arab invasions of the seventh to the tenth centuries (Hay, 24-26). In the late-eighth and early-ninth centuries Charlemagne was hailed as *pater Europae* and Europe as *regnum Caroli* (Denis de Rougemont, *The Idea of Europe*, New York and London,

Macmillan and Collier-Macmillan, 1966, 45-49), although the dream of a unified (western) Europe did not long survive his death. Some writers of the later medieval period and the renaissance, among them Dante, deplored the continuing struggles for power in Europe and urged the establishment of an overriding kingdom under the benevolent guidance of one or another Christian monarch (de Rougemont, 53-87). The Turks, who besieged Vienna in 1552, also came to play the role of an Asian threat to civilization in European eyes (de Rougemont, 88-91). It was not, however, until the enlightenment and the rise of nationalism in the nineteenth century that Europe achieved the importance it now has as a concept and Greece came to assume its influential image as the fountainhead of European civilization (see especially Held's contribution to this volume).

Unlike the definition of "Europe," the word "barbarian," with its derogatory connotations of "speaking gibberish," "uncivilized," "cruel," "slavish," etc., passed from Greek and Latin almost unchanged into most modern European languages. It retained its Roman sense of those outside the boundaries of civilization and was generally applied to non-Europeans. With the spread of Christianity, Aristotle's views about the inferiority of barbarians (see Coleman's contribution to this volume) were overlaid with a further sense of their religious and moral shortcomings. European colonization and the forcible conversion of colonized people to Christianity could thereby be justified as legitimate and "enlightened." Europeans need have no qualms about condemning or interfering with people whom they judged to be "primitive" and "heathens." Even John Stuart Mill, champion of liberty, suggested that barbarians were people incapable of exercising "free and equal discussion" whom it would be theoretically legitimate to dominate for their own good.¹ Barbarians were often further ranked by European scholars as "higher," "lower," and the like, depending on their level of technology and sophistication.²

European ethnocentrism was greatly reinforced by participation in the African slave trade, beginning in the fifteenth century. In the eighteenth century Eurocentrism began to intersect with racism, which provided a new way of dismissing foreign peoples as inferior. A major impetus for the rise of racism was the need for pro-slavery advocates to counter their opponents' religious and moral assertions about the natural unity of humankind (see Ashley Montagu, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Racism*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1974, especially Ch. 1). Racism has continued to be such a powerful force in maintaining the wealth and privilege of European and Ameri-

can elites because it is decked out in the trappings of biology, even if the scientific claims on which it is based can now be shown to be little more than the rationalization of prejudice. Greek and Roman ethnocentrism, by contrast, was based primarily on culture and thus allowed for the possibility, at least in the Roman world, that civilized "barbarians" might eventually participate fully in the commonwealth.

Although archaeological sources are highlighted in the earlier part of the book (many of the contributors are professional archaeologists), the contributors have tried to give a well-rounded picture of some of the major issues. Since we wanted the book to be accessible to general readers as well as to those especially concerned with the ancient world, authors were asked to make their arguments and discussions of evidence as accessible as possible and to deal as fully as possible with the broader implications of their points of view.

The first four contributions are concerned primarily with Bronze Age Greeks and linguistic considerations. They highlight archaeological and linguistic evidence for contacts between Bronze Age (Mycenaean) Greece and the high cultures of the Near East. Clark Walz examines the role played by Cyprus in Aegean/Near Eastern exchange networks and suggests that Martin Bernal's recent work has not adequately considered evidence indicating that Cyprus stood between much contact between the two areas. Roger Woodard advises caution in the evaluation of claims of massive borrowings from Semitic languages in Mycenaean Greek and argues that Iron Age Cyprus was the locus for transmission of the Semitic alphabet to the Greek world. Martin Bernal discusses some linguistic questions of relevance to Greek relationships with the Near East. George Bass reexamines references to the Phoenicians in the *Odyssey* in light of evidence from Late Bronze Age shipwrecks. He concludes that Homer's depictions of Semitic seafarers are accurate, not anachronistic, and, therefore, cannot support a late date for the *Odyssey's* composition. Regardless of the specific positions adopted by the authors, each suggests that patterns of contact established in the Bronze Age had continuing influence in later periods.

The next six contributions focus on the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods.³ Frank Snowden reviews references to Ethiopians (*Aithiopes*) in a variety of Greek sources. He concludes that the Classical world was essentially free from color-based prejudice; claims to the contrary are the result of the projection backward of modern racism. The large number of Egyptian objects recovered from the Heraeum of Samos and other contemporary sites are surveyed by Eleanor Guralnick, who

concludes that there was a significant Egyptian influence on even the most distinctive Greek art form, monumental sculpture. The long relationship between Egyptian and Greek philosophy is surveyed by Anthony Preus, who suggests that Egypt was more influential at various times than is generally recognized. John Coleman examines the nature of Classical Greek ethnocentrism. He summarizes the many different types of contact between Greeks and non-Greeks and documents attitudes towards foreigners before and after the Persian wars. He suggests that, in some ways, Greek society failed to live up to the ideals that it subscribed to and promulgated as the antithesis of barbarism. Susan Rotroff considers the archaeological evidence for relations between Greeks and non-Greeks in the Hellenistic era. She concludes that consideration of indigenous and hybrid artifacts, as well as fully Greek materials, could result in a more accurate picture of ethnic interplay in the Greek East. Mary Lefkowitz offers a critique of the historical reconstructions of modern Afrocentrists through an examination of their ancient predecessors, mythohistorians such as Clement of Alexandria, who argued that Greek culture was inferior to and/or deeply indebted to Jewish and Egyptian civilization.

Three papers on later Greeks and the Classical contribution to Eurocentrism explore the continuing influences of Greece on European civilization. Dirk Held discusses the precedents and exemplars provided by Greece for the creation of later-European self-consciousness, beginning with the rise of modern European nationalism in the eighteenth century. Gail Holst-Warhaft traces two conflicting views of the past in modern Greek nationalism, those of imported Philhellenism and native Orthodox Christianity. The dispute over whether Athens or Constantinople is the proper model for modern Greek society has had a significant impact on the history, culture, and character of modern Greece. Finally, Laura Purdy considers the negative impact of the traditional Classical focus in the humanistic curriculum. She asserts that traditionalists who claim to reject the "politicization" of Classical studies are embracing a different, but equally political, position. She offers criteria by which the competing views of the Classical curriculum may be judged.

The editors would like to thank the many groups and organizations that made the original conference possible. They include the Archaeological Institute of America and Cornell University's College of Arts and Sciences, the Society for the Humanities, the European Studies Program, the Interdisciplinary Program in Archaeology, and the Departments of Classics, History, History of Art, and Near Eastern Studies for

their support of the initial conference. We would also like to express especial thanks to Kenya M. Mayfield, editorial assistant for the book, for her skillful and thoughtful editing. Gary Y. Okihiro read the manuscript of the book as it was nearing its final form and made helpful suggestions. We also acknowledge a debt of gratitude to the following for typing, proofreading individual contributions, checking bibliography, and suggesting improvements of wording: Jacob F. Herrera, Laura C. Hosteny, Marlon I. Moscovitz, Nancy K. Tang, Julie S. Walz, Patricia S. Wren, Catherine C. Yen. Finally, we thank David I. Owen and the other members of the Program of Jewish Studies and the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Cornell for making this publication possible.

John E. Coleman and Clark A. Walz
Ithaca, NY
May, 1997

NOTES

- 1 "Despotism is a legitimate mode of government in dealing with barbarians, provided the end be their improvement, and the means justified by actually effecting that end. Liberty, as a principle, has no application to any state of things anterior to the time when mankind have become capable of being improved by free and equal discussion. Until then, there is nothing for them but implicit obedience to an Akbar or a Charlemagne, if they are so fortunate as to find one. But as soon as mankind have attained the capacity of being guided to their own improvement by conviction or persuasion (a period long since reached in all nations with whom we need here concern ourselves), compulsion, either in the direct form or in that of pains and penalties for non-compliance, is no longer admissible as a means to their own good, and justifiable only for the security of others" (*On Liberty*, Bookshop, CD Titles, Waltham Mass., 5).
- 2 E.g., Charles Darwin, describing the dancing of a people he observed in Australia, wrote: "Every one appeared in high spirits, and the group of nearly naked figures, viewed by the light of the blazing fires, all moving in hideous harmony, formed a perfect display of a festival amongst the lowest barbarians" (*The Voyage of the Beagle*, Bookshop, CD Titles, Waltham Mass., 209).
- 3 Another paper presented at the conference with this group has since been published separately: Jane C. Waldbaum, "Greeks in the East or Greeks and the East? Problems in the Definition and Recognition of Presence," *EASOR* 305 (1997).

Abbreviations

AA	<i>Archäologischer Anzeiger</i>
AAA	<i>Athens Annals of Archaeology</i>
AISA	<i>Annali: Archaeologia e storia antica</i> , Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli
AE	<i>Archaiologike Ephemeris</i>
A/O	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AJPh	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
AM	<i>Athenische Mitteilungen</i>
ANAM	Athens National Archaeological Museum
AOAT	<i>Alter Orient und Altes Testament</i>
AR	<i>Archaeological Reports</i>
ArchEp	<i>Archaiologike Ephemeris</i>
AS	<i>Anatolian Studies</i>
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
AZ	<i>Archäologische Zeitung</i>
ASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BCH	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i>
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeology</i>
BM	<i>Baghdader Mitteilungen</i>
BSA	<i>Annals of the British School of Archaeology in Athens</i>
CAH	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i>
CRAI	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres</i>
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies</i>
IJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
IGCS	<i>International Guide to Classical Studies</i>



Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism

JOHN E. COLEMAN

Hermippos [third century B.C.] in his Lives ascribes to Thales what others say of Socrates. He used to say, they report, that he thanked Fortune for three things: first, that I am a human and not a beast; second, that I am a man and not a woman; third, that I am a Greek and not a barbarian.

Diogenes Laertius [third century A.D.], I, 33
(translation adapted from Barnes, 1987, 67).

THE ANCIENT GREEKS were thoroughly “ethnocentric,” for they considered their culture superior to that of others and tended to look down upon and despise foreigners.¹ Their views were extreme and call for explanation, particularly because their interactions with foreigners were far more extensive and varied than one would predict on the basis of their ethnic stereotypes. Greek ethnocentrism probably had little to do with the foreign peoples themselves and much to do with Greek projections of what they viewed as desirable and undesirable in their own way of life.² Unfortunately, many Greek attitudes were adopted by the Romans, along with the word “barbarian,” and subsequently came to play a major role in shaping modern European and American prejudices against “non-Western” peoples. The stereotype of the “barbarian,” with its connotations of simple-mindedness, coarseness, cruelty, despotism, and slavishness, still plays a harmful role in “Western” attitudes toward other peoples.

My aim is to provide a brief overview of Greek attitudes toward foreigners and to attempt some explanation of why they took the form they did. I have also provided a brief summary of the evidence for

contacts between Greeks and non-Greeks in order to provide a historical framework for understanding and interpreting their attitudes. The final section of the essay raises some questions about modern perceptions of the Greek-barbarian antithesis. My discussion is largely confined to the period between the initial circulation of the major Homeric poems (*Iliad*, *Odyssey*) in the eighth century B.C. and the eastern conquests of Alexander the Great (ruled 336–323 B.C.), since it was then that the concept of Greek ethnicity took shape.³ Greeks were probably less negative toward foreigners in the periods before the Persian wars of the first quarter of the fifth century B.C. than they later became. Their attitudes are best documented for the Classical period (later fifth and the fourth centuries B.C.), however, a time when they were at their most negative as a result of anti-Persian propaganda. Although there were ever wider contacts and closer relationships between Greeks and non-Greeks during the Hellenistic period (ca. 323–331 B.C.) that followed the conquests of Alexander, I would argue that attitudes were only somewhat more enlightened⁴ and that the basic assumptions of Greek superiority remained the same. I have largely omitted from consideration Greek relationships with two western Mediterranean peoples, the Etruscans and the Carthaginians.⁵

This essay is necessarily concerned with the mainstream of Classical Greek thought as it survived to influence later European attitudes. This mainstream was largely represented by the views and debates of a fairly small and what we would nowadays call conservative group of Athenian aristocrats and intellectuals and the selection and preservation in later antiquity of only a small part of Classical literature led to an even narrower focus on a relatively few writers. However, despite such limitations in our evidence, I would doubt on the basis of my own experience that the views of those at the lower levels of Greek society differed significantly from those of the upper classes.⁶

GREEK ETHNICITY AND THE CONCEPT OF THE BARBARIAN

Arable land in the Greek peninsula is sparse and the broken-up geography discouraged large-scale cooperation and the formation of a single overriding political organization. Greek life was centered on independent city-states (*poleis*, sing. *polis*). Athens, the largest, had more than 100,000 inhabitants; the others were generally much smaller. Although Greek cities numbered in the hundreds and sometimes formed regional leagues, they never joined together in a single national state. Even after the conquest of the southern part of the Greek peninsula by the Macedonians

in the fourth century B.C., Greeks were almost continuously at war with one another.⁷ They therefore defined themselves as a separate people not because they were members of a single political entity but on the basis of their common ancestry, language, religion, and way of life.

The essentials of what it was to be Greek are clearly spelled out in a speech attributed to the Athenians by the fifth century B.C. historian Herodotus (VIII, 144): "the community of blood and language, temples and rituals, our common way of life." The practice of competitive athletics was an important part of the Greek way of life and the right to participate in the Olympic games was a sign of one's "Greekness." For example, an attempt is reported by Herodotus (V, 22) to exclude Alexander I of Macedon (ca. 495–450 B.C.) from competing in the Olympic games "on the ground that barbarians were not allowed to take part. Alexander, however, proved his Argive descent and so was accepted as a Greek and allowed to enter the *stadion* race. He tied for first."

When did the Greeks first begin to regard themselves as a separate people or "nation"? The evidence does not permit a clear answer.⁸ By the fifth century B.C. a self-conscious Greek ethnicity was firmly established and the word *ethnos* ("national group"; plural *ethne*) was in use both for Greeks (see, e.g., Herodotus, I, 56) and other peoples.⁹ By the fourth century *genos* (plural *gene*) is also sometimes used to refer to the Greeks collectively (e.g., Plato, *Republic*, 470c, Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 50). Although *genos* has a biological sense (it can also mean "family," "offspring," or "clan") and is often translated as "race," the modern terms "ethnicity" and "ethnic" generally match the Greek concepts better than "race" and "racial," since Greek attitudes were based primarily on language, culture and geography.

It is possible that the concept of a Greek nation existed already in Mycenaean (Bronze Age) times. I would argue, in any case, that it had come into being by the eighth century B.C., on the grounds that it is presupposed by a general belief in the historical reality of a unified Greek expedition against Troy as described in the Homeric poems, which were probably first circulated in written form in that century. On the other hand, Greeks apparently did not refer to themselves collectively as Hellenes (*hellenes*; Greek Ἕλληνες, sing. Ἕλληγ) before the seventh or sixth century B.C., since they are predominantly called Achaeans (*Achaiot*) or Danaans (*Danaot*) in the Homeric poems.

In the Classical era (fifth and fourth centuries B.C.) Greeks tended to lump foreigners together as barbarians (*barbaroi*; Greek βαρβαροι, sing. βαρβαρος), although they also used national names for specific peoples

when required (Thracians, Lydians, Persians, Egyptians, *etc.*). The primary distinction between Hellenes and barbarians was probably originally based on language: Hellenes spoke Greek, whereas all others did not. *Barbaros* seems only gradually to have come into use in parallel with *hellen*. In the Homeric poems, for instance, foreigners are referred to individually by ethnic names.¹⁰ That *hellenes* and *barbaroi* were interdependent, if antithetic, terms is suggested by a passage in the fifth-century B.C. historian Thucydides (1, 3): "Homer did not use the term *barbaroi* because *hellenes* on their part had not yet been distinguished under one name as opposed to them."¹¹

Barbaros was onomatopoeic, as is noted by the geographer Strabo (14, 2, 28), who lived in the late first century B.C. and early first century A.D. Originally it meant people who spoke in unintelligible syllables that sounded to Greek ears like "bar-bar."¹² "Gibberish people" would be a reasonable translation. The word is only sparsely attested before the Persian wars of the early fifth century B.C. It may have originated in Asia Minor and gradually passed into more general use (Hall, 1989, 10-11); at least one Greek group, the Spartans, evidently did not use it in Herodotus' day (Herodotus, IX, 11). The poet Anacreon (sixth century B.C.) used it of incorrect or inept speech (Page, 1974, 103, S 313; Hall, 1989, 10) and about 500 B.C. the philosopher Heraclitus wrote with characteristic terseness (Diels and Kranz, 1951-1952, I, 175, fragment 107): "eyes and ears are bad witnesses for people with barbarian souls." Even if the precise sense of the passage is somewhat obscure, "barbarian" clearly has a pejorative sense and refers to more than language. Heraclitus was equating "barbarian" with "lacking the appropriate language," "irrational" or something similar, and saying that only appropriately articulate or rational people can accurately interpret the sometimes misleading evidence of their senses.

Soloikos, another word used of foreigners in Archaic and later times, also centers on language and is similarly pejorative. It means "speaking incorrectly," "using broken Greek," "erring against good manners," *etc.* It was said in later antiquity to come from the corruption of the Attic dialect among the Athenian colonists of Soloi in Cilicia (Strabo, 14, 2, 28) and it gives us the English word "solecism."

THE EXTENT AND NATURE OF GREEK CONTACT WITH FOREIGNERS

During what is known as the Greek "dark ages," from about 1000 B.C. on, the Greeks rapidly expanded their territory, beginning with colonization of the eastern littoral of the Aegean sea (the western coast of Asia Minor).¹³ The northern part was colonized by speakers of the Aeolic dialect of Greek, the central part by speakers of the Ionic dialect, and the southern part by speakers of the Doric dialect. This period is sometimes known as the period of migrations, though ancient writers use the same word (*apoikiai*) for these early colonies in the Aegean and those which followed during what modern scholars describe as the "age of colonization" (ca. 750-600 B.C.). In the later stage, Greek cities came to ring the Mediterranean and the Black Sea like "frogs around a pond," to use Plato's words (*Phaedo*, 109b). Dozens of Greek colonies were sent out to the northern Aegean, the Black Sea, north Africa, Italy (the southern part of which became known to Latin speakers as *Magna Graecia*, "Great Greece"), and the western Mediterranean. Although the cities of Aegean Greece were more numerous (at least 750, as opposed to some 100 colonies abroad), many of the colonies were large and prosperous, as shown, for example, by their offerings at the panhellenic sanctuaries of Olympia and Delphi.

On the eastern coast of the Aegean and everywhere else in the Mediterranean Greeks came into close contact with local people, including Eteocypriots in Cyprus, Carians, Lydians, and Phrygians in Anatolia, Thracians, Skythians and Taurians in the northern Aegean and the Black Sea, Libyans in Cyrenaica, Illyrians in the Adriatic, native Sicels and Punic colonists in Sicily, Etruscans and Italic peoples in Italy and Celts and Ligurians in the western Mediterranean.

The colonies generally maintained a separate, Greek, identity and reproduced the political institutions of the mother city or cities. The colonists were initially on a more or less equal economic footing with one another, since each received an equal allotment of land, both within the city wall (for a house) and outside (for purposes of agriculture). Relations with the indigenous cultures varied greatly. In some places the Greeks may have been welcomed, especially by native rulers wishing to enhance their status and prosperity; elsewhere there was open warfare. In addition to land, the colonists would have required much raw material, such as metals, and labor in the form of slaves, both for their own use and for export. Although there was probably more contact and intermixture

between colonists and indigenous people than most ancient sources allow,¹⁴ it is safe to say that the Greeks generally maintained a position of control and authority over the natives and that, like so many later colonizing powers, they adopted a mentality that dismissed local people and customs as inferior.¹⁵

In the Aegean region, slavery would have been the most common means by which Greeks came into contact with foreigners. The Greek way of life depended on chattel slaves as laborers and household servants. Slaves are frequently mentioned in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, their use is recommended in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (405-6, 441), their nature and status is discussed in some detail in Aristotle's *Politics* and they play an important role as agricultural workers in Xenophon's ideal estate, as set forth in *Oeconomicus* (e.g., 5, 14-16). Hardly any Greek household was without them, even the poorest. Some skilled slaves served their masters as revenue producing artisans.

Some idea of the numbers of slaves in Classical Athens may be gained from the fact that we are told that twenty thousand deserted during the time of the Peloponnesian war.¹⁶ Although most slaves were privately owned, the city of Athens had a corps of several hundred Skythian archers of slave status as a police force in the later fifth century B.C. (Wiedemann, 1988, 155) and, like other cities, employed public slaves for other activities (Wiedemann, 1988, 154-157). Xenophon (*Ways and Means*, 1, 13-25; quoted in Wiedemann, 1988, 95-97) recommended in the early fourth century B.C. that Athens solve its financial difficulties by taking on public ownership of up to 10,000 or more slaves, which it would then lease out for mining and other tasks.

The evidence suggests that by far the majority of slaves in Greece in the Classical period were foreigners. Although detailed estimates are not possible, the sources assembled by Wiedemann (1988) and others indicate that almost every foreign group known to the Greeks would have been represented, probably including Ethiopian blacks (Snowden, 1970, 184-186 and this volume). Many slaves came from Thrace and Phrygia. Although the written sources, particularly tragedy, emphasize the role of warfare as a source, many slaves would have been procured direct from their native lands by a combination of coercion and trade (Finley, 1980, 84-89; Garlan, 1987) similar to that which took place in West Africa in the 16th to the nineteenth centuries. Slaves were relatively cheap: they were sold in late fifth-century Athens for as little as 150 drachmas or so and 1000 drachmas was an exceptional price (Meiggs and Lewis, 1969, no. 79; Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 2, 5).¹⁷ Presumably the slave dealers, when

they purchased slaves rather than simply capturing them, paid much less in the source countries. For instance, in a reference that, although post-Classical (of the first century B.C.), is probably also relevant for Classical Greece, Diodorus (V, 26, 3) writes that traders could buy a slave in southern France for the price of an amphora of wine.

There may often have been a close connection between Greek wine and foreign slaves. Wine was one of the most common, if not the most common, of Greek exports and it was much sought after by "barbarians." In the Hallstatt culture of western central Europe, for instance, Greek and Etruscan vessels connected with wine are commonly found in chieftains' graves of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. and slaves may have been a primary export (Cunliffe, 1988, 24-32). The linkage of trade in wine and slaves is also suggested by the reliefs on the tombstone of Aulos Kapreilios Timotheos, a self-identified slave dealer from Thrace who died about the time of Christ (Duchène, 1986; Finley, 1977): one, which depicts men transporting large vats and an amphora, can be plausibly linked with the manufacture of wine; immediately beneath it is a scene with a file of slaves led by an overseer. Perhaps Aulos made wine on his own North Aegean estate and traded it directly for slaves in the neighboring hinterland, as is attested for southern France by the passage quoted above from Diodorus.

As a consequence of the ubiquity of slavery, Greeks of every age and status had contact during their lives with dozens, if not hundreds, of foreign slaves. That the foreigners most frequently encountered by Classical Greeks were of such low status was surely a significant factor in the recurrent portrayal of "barbarians" as inferior in character or nature.

Other foreigners came to the Aegean as traders, artisans, mercenaries, ambassadors, and consultants to the various oracles. There were many foreign merchants and artisans, for instance, among the metics (resident aliens) at Athens, and presumably in other Greek cities. In the early sixth century B.C. Solon deliberately adopted measures to attract artisans to Athens and potters and vase painters of the sixth and early fifth centuries B.C. sometimes have foreign names (e.g., *Amasis*, *Lydos*, *Thrax*, *Kolchos*, *Skythes*; Boardman, 1974, 12). Xenophon (*Ways and Means*, II, 1 III, 5) writes in the early fourth century B.C. that a large part of the metic population of Athens consisted of "Lydians, Phrygians, Syrians, and barbarians of all sorts." Metics and other foreigners were mostly active as laborers and in commerce, trade and banking. These activities were viewed as demeaning by many Greeks, since the dominating values in Greek society

were those of the landed aristocracy, which gave priority to leisure and a life of the mind. Metics had limited civic rights at Athens.

"Barbarians" also served as mercenaries in Greek lands. For instance, by the time of the Peloponnesian war, if not earlier, Thracians were commonly employed by Athens and Sparta as light armed auxiliaries (Parke, 1933, 17-18). The Odomantian Thracians sent to Athens by king Sitalkes are depicted in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* as particularly brutish and Thracian brutality is also remarked on by Thucydides (VII, 29) in the context of the massacre of women and children at Mycalessos by Thracian mercenaries. The Skythian police force of Athens already mentioned was probably also used in war when necessary.

Ambassadors from the great foreign powers of Lydia, Egypt, and Persia visited Greece on many occasions. A Persian ambassador ("Pseudo-artabas") is memorably parodied in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* and the Athenians and Spartans must even have had foreign translators, since they were able to read documents in Assyrian cuneiform at the time of the Peloponnesian wars (Thucydides, 4, 50; cf. Mosley, 1971). Foreign consultants of the oracles at Dodona, Delphi, and Branchidae and foreign dedications at those and other shrines are a commonplace in our written sources. Croesus of Lydia, for instance, was famous for his consultations of oracles and his many dedications at Delphi (see especially Herodotus, I, 46-56). Amasis of Egypt also consulted Delphi and made dedications in Greek sanctuaries, including wooden statues of himself in Samos (Herodotus, II, 182; see Guralnick, this volume).

Mainland Greeks also came to have a closer acquaintance with foreigners from the Eastern Mediterranean and the Near East as a result of Xerxes' invasion of 480/479 B.C. The invading force comprised hundreds of thousands of troops and supporting personnel from all over the Persian empire (Herodotus, VII, 61-80) and some will have stayed behind after the defeat as prisoners and slaves.

The depiction of foreigners in Greek art of the sixth and fifth centuries provides confirmation that they were an everyday sight on the streets of the larger Greek cities. Skythian archers, for instance, appear on some 400 Athenian vases of the later sixth century B.C. (Vos, 1963) and Thracian peltasts are also common on vases of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. (Best, 1969). In late Archaic times the statue of a Thracian or Skythian horseman was dedicated on the Acropolis at Athens (Acr. 606: Payne and Mackworth-Young, 1950, 52 and pls. 134, 135; Vos, 1963, 66; Ridgway, 1977, 142). Black Ethiopians are also depicted in pottery, the most striking examples being the rhyta with the head of a black juxtaposed with

that of a white (e.g., Snowden, 1970, fig. 12).¹⁸ There are also many hundreds of representations of Amazons (Von Bothmer, 1957), often with Skythian costume and gear. Although Amazons do not, of course, provide evidence for the actual presence of foreigners, their frequency indicates the strong hold that non-Greek peoples and customs had upon the imagination of Classical Greeks.

Greeks themselves often traveled and settled in foreign lands as traders, mercenaries, and craftsmen. They too were sometimes transported to foreign lands as slaves. The Greek cities of Cyprus, such as Salamis, Paphos and Soloi, although usually neglected in histories of Greek colonization, were probably important contact points between Greeks and non-Greeks from the twelfth or eleventh century B.C. on. Contacts with Phoenicia (modern Syria and Lebanon), which began already in the Bronze Age and are reflected in the references to Phoenicians and Sidonians in the Homeric poems (Bass, this volume), were later renewed and reinforced, as is witnessed by the Greek adoption of the Semitic alphabet, perhaps in Cyprus (Woodard, this volume). Greek mercenaries were active in Egypt (Parke, 1933, 3-6), and probably elsewhere in the Near East (Boardman, 1980, 50-51) by the early seventh century B.C. The poet Alcaeus' brother Antimenidas fought on behalf of a Babylonian king, possibly at Ascalon, about 600 B.C. By this means, Greeks came into close contact not only with Egyptians but also, for the first time, with substantial numbers of Ethiopians (Snowden, this volume). Especially notable are Greek and Carian mercenaries who fought with Amasis in his unsuccessful defense of Egypt against the Persians in 525 B.C. (Herodotus, III, 11). The poet Sappho's brother Charaxus fell in love with a courtesan in Egypt (Herodotus, II, 135) and we are told by Strabo (27, I, 33) that he was there bringing Lesbian wine for sale. The courtesan, Rodopis, was herself a former Thracian slave, brought to Egypt by her Greek master (Herodotus II, 134). From the early sixth century on, the Ionian trading post at Naukratis in the Nile delta gave many opportunities for contact between Greeks and Egyptians (Herodotus, II, 178-179). Herodotus writes (III, 139) that at the time of Cambyses (529-521 B.C.) "a great many Greeks visited [Egypt] for one reason or another: some, as was to be expected, for trade, some to serve in the army, others no doubt out of mere curiosity..."

Ionian craftsmen were engaged to work on the great palace and administrative center built by Darius at Persepolis in the late sixth century B.C. and Greeks are probably also represented in the reliefs there bringing tribute to Darius. It is even possible that the Apadana reliefs at

Persepolis influenced the Panathenaic frieze on the Parthenon at Athens (Root, 1985). Greeks are mentioned as traveling or being transported on the great Royal road from Sardis to the Persian capital at Susa on many occasions, often to seek the Great King's financial and/or military support. Examples from the late sixth century B.C. (see Hofstetter, 1979) are Hippias, once tyrant of Athens, who accompanied the Persians at the battle of Marathon (Herodotus, VI, 107); Histiaius, tyrant of Miletus, who was kept in honorable custody (Herodotus, V, 25); Democedes, a physician from Croton (Herodotus, III, 129-138); and Demaratos, former king of Sparta, who accompanied Xerxes during his invasion of Greece (Herodotus, VI, 70; VII, 234). Herodotus himself apparently traveled as far as Babylon in the mid-fifth century B.C. (I, 183) and the Greek physician Ctesias, who wrote treatises on Persia and India, was a member of the court of Artaxerxes II in the late fifth and early fourth centuries B.C.

As a result of all these contacts, Greek literature and art were strongly influenced by the ancient Near East and Egypt, especially during the late eighth and the seventh centuries B.C., the "orientalizing period" of Greek art (Burkert, 1992). During that time, Greek mythology and especially the poetry of Hesiod was influenced by that of Anatolia and Mesopotamia (Burkert, 1992). The Greek words for papyrus (*byblos* or *biblos*) and paper or scroll (*byblion* or *biblion*) come from the name of the Phoenician city of Byblos. Egyptian bronze sculptures reached Greece from the dark ages on and monumental male statues (*kouroi*) were strongly influenced by Egyptian sculpture (Guralnick, this volume and references there cited).

Food, in the form of grain, and many other materials and products essential to the Greek way of life had to be imported into the Aegean from "barbarian" lands. Greek trading voyages are mentioned by Hesiod in the late eighth or early seventh century B.C. as if they were regular activities (*Works and Days*, 618-694, especially 631-632). The volume of foreign trade in the Classical period must have been enormous, especially when we take into account that trade is downplayed by the surviving Greek writers, who tend to have a low opinion of those engaged in commercial activity, and that imports to Greece are poorly attested in the archaeological record because they were mostly in the form of raw materials which do not leave physical traces. Besides grain from the Black Sea and Egypt (e.g., Meijer and Van Nijf, 1992, 93-98; Austin, 1970, 35), imports included timber, which came into the southern Aegean from Macedonia and Thrace (Meiggs, 1982) and metals from Spain, Sardinia, Etruria, Cyprus, and Egypt (Boardman, 1980). Other goods included perfume and

clothing from the Near East and, at least by the end of the fifth century B.C., silk from the Far East.¹⁹ Cinnamon and pepper may also have been imported from India as early as the Classical period, although it is uncertain in what quantity.²⁰ Greek exports are better attested in the archaeological record than imports, since they included oil and wine, which were transported in long-lasting and easily recognizable terra-cotta amphorae (e.g., Meijer and Van Nijf, 1992, 110-115), fine pottery and metalwork. Hundreds of thousands of Greek pots have already been recorded in Egypt, the Levant, the Black Sea, Etruria, and the western Mediterranean (Boardman, 1980) and every year the number increases.

The evidence for trade shows that the realities of Greek life were far different from the self-sufficiency of the ideal cities pictured by Plato (*Republic*, *Laws*) and Aristotle (*Politics*). Sea-going trade was essential to Greek prosperity and Classical Greek civilization, in which the interests and activities of a leisure class played a large role, would have been impossible without the materials and products provided by non-Greeks.

Foreign influences on Greek culture were considerable. Gods of indisputably foreign origin worshipped in Greece in Classical times, for instance, include Egyptian Isis, the Cypriot or Phoenician dying-god Adonis, the Anatolian divinities Cybele, Hecate and Sabazius, and the Thracian divinities Bendis and Cotyto (Burkert, 1985; Long, 1986, 20-49). Although the cults of these divinities were probably brought originally to Greece by resident merchants and slaves in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., they came to have large Greek followings and to enjoy high status. Cybele, for instance, was installed in Greek religion as "Mother of the Gods"; there is a hymn to Hecate encapsulated in the text of Hesiod's *Theogony* (411-452); and a festival of Bendis is the occasion for Socrates' visit to the Peiraeus at the opening of Plato's *Republic*. Worship of the wine-god Dionysus was probably a mixture of Greek and non-Greek elements. Although Dionysus was believed in antiquity to have come to Greece from Thrace or Anatolia, his name is at least partly Greek and he was apparently worshipped already in Mycenaean times (Burkert, 1985, 162). Perhaps Dionysus acquired a foreign origin and foreign characteristic in the course of time because his worship took orgiastic forms which made many Greeks feel uncomfortable (as, e.g., in Euripides *Bacchae*).

Classical Greek music, like its modern counterpart, was strongly influenced by Anatolia and the Near East (e.g., Long, 1986, 63-69; West, 1992, especially 386-390), both the instruments themselves and the hymns, songs, and dirges they produced. "Phrygian" and "Lydian," for instance, were terms applied by the Greeks to modes of music (e.g., Plato,

Laches, 188d). Strabo (10, 3, 17; quoted in Long, 1986, 35), writing in the later first century B.C. says that "all music is to some extent Thracian or Asian." The importance of music in daily life and its influence on other arts, such as poetry, dance, and drama, can hardly be overemphasized.

From this brief survey, we can see that the Greeks had close and varied contacts with foreigners of all sorts. Let us now consider in further detail the evidence for general views of foreign peoples, both before and after the Persian wars.

GREEK ATTITUDES TOWARDS FOREIGNERS BEFORE THE PERSIAN WARS

The written evidence for early Greek attitudes is sparse and sometimes difficult to interpret. The summary that follows emphasizes instances in which I think negative attitudes are pretty clear. These are sufficient to show that the roots of Greek ethnocentrism go back to an early stage of Greek thought, even if attitudes were then more varied and generally less pejorative than they later became. As we saw above, the word *barbaros* was used only occasionally for foreigners before the Persian invasions of Greece in 490 and 480-479 B.C.

We begin with the Homeric poems, the earliest extant examples of Greek literature. Although they focus on the Trojan war, which was later taken to represent a struggle between Greece and Asia (e.g., Herodotus, I, 3-4), the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are generally free of explicit prejudice against non-Greeks. As already noted, the poems do not employ the term "barbaroi." In fact, except for the passages enumerated above (note 10), the issue of foreign languages does not arise; the Trojans and their allies are simply pictured without comment as being able to communicate with the Greeks. The Trojan allies are mostly peoples of the northern Aegean (e.g., Thracians, Paionians) and western Asia Minor (e.g., Phrygians, Lycians, Carians). On the rare occasions when other peoples of Asia or Africa are mentioned, such as the Egyptians or Ethiopians (see Snowden in this volume), they are quite unrealistic and ahistorical. The Phoenicians are a significant exception, since they are realistically depicted as visiting and trading in Aegean waters, which may reflect the historical situation either in the Bronze Age (Bass, this volume) or in the early Iron Age; they are mostly mentioned as dealing in trinkets and stealing women and are always cast in a negative light (Finley, 1979, 102). Guest-friendship (*xenia*), an institution that often figures in the poems and probably survived from the world of the Bronze Age, may also be mentioned. Its

tokens are exchanges of hospitality and gifts between elite members of different cities or regions and in the Homeric poems it is sometimes extended to foreigners as well as Greeks (Finley, 1979, 95-103). The ties of *xenia* can sometimes override the divisions of war as, for instance in the case of the Greek hero Diomedes and the Lycian hero Glaucus (*Iliad* VI, 119-236).

Opinion about ethnocentrism in the Homeric poems ranges widely (summarized in Hall, 1989, 21-32; Mackie, 1996, 7-9). I would argue that those who see them as free from prejudice are misled by the rarity of overt bias like that later directed toward the Persians. The poems consistently represent Greeks as superior to their enemies in most ways that were important to Greek culture. The Trojans and their allies have fewer heroes, for instance, and none of them is depicted as a match for the best of the Achaeans, with the possible exception of Hektor. The Trojan forces are described in much less detail in the catalogues of forces in *Iliad* II (344 lines vs 91 for the Trojans, including the opening similes), their speech is clamorous and their social and military organization lacking in cohesion in comparison with that of the Greeks (Mackie, 1996, ch. 1). Mackie (1996, chs. 2-4) also argues that their speech is less assertive and warlike and more poetic than that of the Greeks. Since the primary Homeric virtue is prowess in battle and the fame which results from it and since the Trojan war is presented as a total Greek victory, I think that ancient listeners and readers of the Homeric poems, like most modern ones, simply regarded it as obvious that the Trojans and their allies were inferior to the Greeks.²¹

Greek colonization, summarized in the previous section, strongly encouraged Greeks to feel superior to the other peoples of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. The ideals of Greek society always tended to have a strong military component. War was regarded as the "natural" result of human acquisitiveness²² and Greek cities often made war against one another as well as against the "barbarians." None of the people in the colonized lands were able to successfully resist the Greeks by force of arms and all came eventually to be dominated by the Greeks in both political and cultural spheres. The peoples in the colonized areas tended to be organized into tribes and chiefdoms, whereas the Greeks had little respect for institutions other than that of the city-state. Foreigners' initial unfamiliarity with the effects of wine may also have made them seem weak in Greek eyes.²³ Closely related to colonization was the gradual elaboration of the Greek mythic system and its universalization to include all peoples known to the Greeks. Since the myths were centered on the

activities of Greek gods and heroes (see, for example, Georges, 1994, ch. 1), they would also have reinforced Greek feelings of superiority.

In the ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries B.C. the Greeks came into contact in the Eastern Mediterranean with powerful civilizations that lay beyond the areas they colonized. The Assyrians, whose military conquests reached the shores of the Mediterranean in the eighth century B.C., were later dimly remembered. In the mid-sixth century B.C., for instance, Phokylides wrote: "A well-governed *polis* on a crag is better than silly Nineveh" (Rose, 1960, 68). Near Easterners, for their part, thought of the Greeks as traders in slaves and bronze. The biblical prophet Ezekiel, for instance, who lived in the first half of the sixth century B.C., wrote of Phoenician Tyre, destroyed by the Babylonians about 586 B.C., that "Javan [sc. "Ionian" Greeks], Tubal [north Cilicia] and Meshech [Phrygia] traded with [it]; they exchanged human beings and vessels of bronze for [its] merchandise" (Metzger and Murphy, 1991, 1092).

Nearer to home, in Asia Minor, relations with the kingdom of Phrygia, powerful in the eighth century B.C., may have led the Greeks to adopt the unflattering picture of its king Midas attested in myth and painting (see below). In the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. the kingdom of Lydia succeeded that of Phrygia and the Greek cities of western Asia Minor gradually came under the sway of its vigorous Mermnad rulers, who included Gyges (ca. 680–644 B.C.), Alyattes (ca. 612–581 B.C.) and Croesus (ca. 561–546 B.C.). Lydia was the first Asiatic empire to subjugate Greeks on a large scale and images of Lydian tyranny and luxury had a lasting effect on the way that Greeks viewed foreigners. Although the Greeks had positive as well as negative relations with the Lydians (Georges, 1994, 22–46 and the ancient sources collected in Pedley, 1972), the wealth of the Lydian rulers, their absolute power, and their promotion of tyrannies in the adjacent Greek cities encouraged Greek stereotypes of western Asiatics.²⁴ After Cyrus' capture of the Lydian capital of Sardis in 546 B.C., the Persians inherited the Lydian empire and they in turn came to represent archetypal Eastern traits for the Greeks, even before their invasion of the Greek mainland.

A factor in Greek attitudes toward foreigners probably closely related to the rise of Lydia was the supposed dichotomy of Europe and Asia.²⁵ In the early fifth century B.C., for instance, Hecataeus divided his geographical treatise (*Periegesis*) into two parts, Europe and Asia.²⁶ Herodotus (e.g., I, 1–5) regarded the Persian wars as a continuation of earlier mythical conflicts between Europe and Asia. This is not to say, however, that the Greeks had any concept of "European civilization"; on

the contrary, they regarded all other dwellers in Europe as barbarians and inferior to Greeks.²⁷ It is therefore somewhat ironic that many later European peoples have found it advantageous to proclaim themselves heirs to the glories of Greek culture and that Greek ethnocentrism has provided one of the main bases for Eurocentrism.

Two foreign kings figure in Greek mythology in derogatory, if somewhat comic roles. The picture of Midas of Phrygia, with his asses ears and golden touch, probably owes something to a real king, mentioned in Assyrian documents and buried at Gordium. Although representations of Midas are known from the middle of the sixth century B.C., the asses ears are so far attested no earlier than the fifth century B.C. (Roller, 1988). Busiris of Egypt has a more savage character, since he (and the Egyptians) are depicted from the middle of the sixth century B.C. on as practicing human sacrifice (Laurens, 1986); the comic side of the story is in his unsuccessful attempt to sacrifice Herakles.

GREEK ATTITUDES TOWARDS FOREIGNERS AFTER THE PERSIAN WARS

Greek attitudes toward foreigners, which, as I suggest above, already tended toward the negative in earlier times, became overwhelmingly negative after the Persian wars of the first quarter of the fifth century B.C. This was the time in which the Greeks, and particularly the state of Athens, "invented the barbarian," to paraphrase the title of Hall's book (1989), as an antithesis of all that was grand and glorious in their culture. The excellence of every kind of intellectual and artistic activity in Athens, the influence of her democratic ideology and her increasing domination of the Aegean during the middle years of the fifth century caused Athenian attitudes to become predominant throughout much of the Greek world. As a result, the highly pejorative Athenian view of foreigners as those outside the mainstream of enlightened civilization became almost universal in Greece. Athenian stereotypes, and the prejudice against "barbarians" that they led to, have tended to be taken as justified and "normal" ever since.

Generally, it was in the sphere of culture that the Greek sense of superiority was expressed. In particular, great emphasis was put on the intellectual achievements made possible by the Greek institution of the *polis*, as is clearly expressed about 380 B.C. by Isocrates (*Panagyrus*, 50): "[Athens] has brought it about that the name 'Hellenes' suggests no

longer a race (*genos*) but an intelligence, and that the title 'Hellenes' is applied rather to those who share our culture than to those who share our blood."²⁸

It was not a self-evident truth for ancient Greeks that "all men are created equal." A few thinkers in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., such as Antiphon and the Cynics, may have explored such a concept, largely on the basis of common biology/physiology (see below). However, apart from a belief in their own common ancestry (the "community of blood" mentioned by Herodotus, VIII, 144), Greek attitudes towards foreigners had little to do with biology. Snowden (this volume and references there cited) has demonstrated convincingly, for instance, that the Greeks were free from color prejudice. On the other hand, the inferiority of non-Greeks was sometimes attributed to the effects of climate. Climate figures, for instance, as the most important determinant in a lengthy comparison between Asia and Europe in the treatise *Airs, Waters, Places*, attributed to Hippocrates and written in the late fifth or early fourth century B.C. Asia is said (12) to be a place where everything grows to far greater beauty and size and where the customs of the inhabitants are more mild and gentle. Such favorable conditions, however, "make it impossible for courage, endurance, industry and high spirit to arise among its inhabitants, whether natives or immigrants, but pleasure must reign supreme." The author goes on to write (16) that:

With regard to the lack of spirit and courage among the inhabitants, the chief reason why Asiatics are less warlike and more gentle in character than Europeans is the uniformity of the seasons, which show no violent changes either towards heat or towards cold, but are equable. For there occur no mental shocks nor violent physical change, which are more likely to steel the temper and impart to it a fierce passion than is a monotonous sameness. For it is changes of all things that rouse the temper of man and prevent its stagnation. For these reasons, I think, Asiatics are feeble. Their institutions are a contributory cause, the greater part of Asia being governed by kings. Now when men are not their own masters and independent, but are ruled by despots, they are not keen on military efficiency but on not appearing warlike. For the risks they run are not similar. Subjects are likely to be forced to undergo military service, fatigue and death, in order to benefit their masters, and to be parted from their wives, their children and their friends. All their worthy, brave deeds merely serve to aggrandize and raise up their lords, while the harvest they themselves reap is danger and death. Moreover, the land of men like these must be desert, owing to their enemies and their laziness, so that even if a naturally brave and spirited man is born his temper is changed by their institutions.

The same factors of climate and customs dominate the discussion of Europe later in the treatise (23):

The other people of Europe [apart from the Skythians, who have just been described in nearly fantastic terms] differ from one another both in stature and in shape, because of the changes of the seasons, which are violent and frequent, while there are severe heat waves, severe winters, copious rains and then long droughts, and winds, causing many changes of various kinds. Wherefore it is natural to realize that generation too varies in the coagulation of the seed [i.e., in the formation of the foetus], and is not the same for the same seed in summer as in winter nor in rain as in drought. It is for this reason, I think, that the physique of Europeans varies more than that of Asiatics, and that their stature differs very widely in each city. For there arise more corruptions in the coagulation of the seed when the changes of the seasons are frequent than when they are similar or alike. The same reasoning applies also to character. In such a climate arise wildness, unsociability and spirit. For the frequent shocks to the mind impart wildness, destroying tameness and gentleness. For this reason, I think, Europeans are also more courageous than Asiatics. For uniformity engenders slackness, while variation fosters endurance in both body and soul; rest and slackness are food for cowardice, endurance and exertion for bravery. Wherefore Europeans are more warlike, and also because of their institutions, not being under kings as are Asiatics.

(both passages from Loeb translation)

Aristotle later wrote in a similar vein but with still greater ethnocentricity (*Politics* 1327b23-34):

The nations that live in cold regions and those of Europe are full of spirit, but somewhat lacking in skill and intellect; for this reason, while remaining relatively free, they lack political cohesion and the ability to rule over their neighbors. On the other hand the Asiatic nations have in their souls both intellect and skill, but are lacking in spirit; so they remain enslaved and subject. The Hellenic race, occupying a mid-point geographically, has a measure of both, being both spirited and intelligent. Hence, it continues to be free, to live under the best constitutions and, given a *single* constitution, to be capable of ruling all other people.

(translation: Penguin)

Nor would Greeks have been enthusiastic about the value often put in modern times on diversity within a given society, whether ethnic or intellectual. They would have been appalled, for instance, at the idea of society as a "melting pot" or of civic policies as a balance or compromise between opposing views. Hence they were very negative in theory about mingling with foreigners, despite the many interactions summarized in this essay. For example, the Athenian stranger, the chief speaker in Plato's

Laws, appears to decry interbreeding even among the subdivisions of the Greeks; he remarks in horror (3, 693) that if the Athenians and Lacedaemonians had not joined in repulsing the Persians, "we should have by now virtually a complete mixture of races (*gene*)—Greek with Greek, Greek with barbarian, and barbarian with Greek. We can see a parallel in the nations whom the Persians lord it over today; they have been split up and then horribly jumbled together again into the scattered communities in which they now live." Such views assume that the best life is one in a small, ethnically homogeneous city in which the inhabitants are in concord about political affairs.

Many negative and stereotypical portrayals of foreigners are to be found in the tragedians and the philosophers of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Euripides (ca. 485–406 B.C.) is particularly skillful at portraying and manipulating the common attitudes of his audiences. The Thracian king Polymnestor in *Hecuba*, for instance, presents the audience with a catalogue of stereotypical barbarian vices: he is avaricious, equivocal in his allegiance, and thoroughly mendacious. Thoas in *Iphigeneia in Taurus* and Theoclymenus in *Helen* share many vices with Polymnestor. Hall has suggested (1989, 107) that Euripides invented all three kings "precisely in order to provide an opportunity for exploring vices stereotypically imputed to the barbarian character." Other barbarian characters in Euripides represent undesirable extremes. Medea, for instance, epitomizes intemperance, the Phrygian slave in *Orestes* cowardice. The self-serving function of such stereotypes is often apparent, as, for instance, when Achilles says in Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis* (lines 1400–1401), "It is right and reasonable that Greeks should rule over barbarians and not barbarians over Greeks; for these are slaves and those free." It is not necessary to the point here to suggest that Euripides or the other playwrights were themselves strongly prejudiced against foreigners;²⁹ merely that their stereotypical barbarian characters reflect common attitudes of their society.

Not even Aeschylus' *Persians* is as sympathetic a portrayal of the Greeks' enemies as is sometimes claimed. Xerxes is depicted as so devastated by the defeat at Salamis, even after his return to Susa weeks later, that he indulges in beating his breast and tearing his hair. The Athenian audience would surely have regarded this behavior as intemperate and womanish (Hall, 1993, 120; Holst-Warhaft, 1992, 130–133) and therefore reprehensible in a Greek ruler.³⁰ Xerxes' excessive grief and the demoralization of the Persian court also serves to exaggerate the importance of the defeat to the Persians, presumably in order to play up the glories won

by the Greeks. In reality, in 472 B.C., when the play was performed, Xerxes was still comfortably in control of the largest, wealthiest, and best organized empire the world had yet known.³¹ The *Persians* also reinforces the stereotype of barbarians as incapable of understanding the gods and their messages (Georges, 1994, ch. 4).

Although comedy is harder to interpret, it is probably significant that non-Greeks, who are frequently brought on stage, are never presented in a positive light in the fifth century B.C. (Long, 1986, ch. 6). As in tragedy, barbarian characters in comedy represent a catalogue of faults and vices. One thinks especially, for instance, of the lust and stupidity of the Skythian archer in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*.

Plato (429–347 B.C.) employs stereotypes of barbarians on occasion, as, for instance, when he has Socrates say in the *Republic* (435e–436a) that the Phoenicians and Egyptians are characterized by a love of money (as opposed to the Greeks' love of knowledge) or (470c) that Greeks and barbarians are enemies by nature. For Aristotle (384–322 B.C.), barbarians are generally similar or identical by nature to slaves and are fit only to be ruled (e.g., *Politics*, 1252a34, where he quotes the line of Achilles in *Iphigeneia in Aulis* mentioned above). The statement in *Politics* 1285a16 is typical of his general assessment: "it is because barbarians are by natural character more slavish than Greeks (and Asiatics than Europeans) that they tolerate master-like rule without resentment." Plutarch, a writer of the first and second centuries A.D., also reports about advice given by Aristotle to Alexander the Great (*Moralia* 329b) that:

Alexander did not do as Aristotle advised—play the part of a leader to the Greeks and of a master to the barbarians, care for the former as friends and kinsmen, and treat the latter as beasts or plants, and so fill his reign with wars, banishments and factions; he behaved alike to all. (translation: Ross, 1952)

A letter surviving in Arabic copies that purports to be from Aristotle to Alexander also recommends that Alexander exile the Persian nobles to Europe, primarily as a matter of revenge (Stern, 1968).³²

It is perhaps not so surprising that otherwise great thinkers like these could have accepted and employed such obviously fallacious stereotypes, if we recall that their ideal societies were based on small cities in which *homonotia* (concord or unity of thought) was to be a guiding principle. Both also held typically aristocratic attitudes toward trade and commerce, which was often managed by non-citizens, and wished to keep the ports, with their foreign contagion, on the periphery of their utopias (e.g., Plato, *Laws*, 3, 701–704; Aristotle, *Politics* 1327a11–1327b).

Laws, appears to decry interbreeding even among the subdivisions of the Greeks; he remarks in horror (3, 693) that if the Athenians and Lacedaemonians had not joined in repulsing the Persians, "we should have by now virtually a complete mixture of races (*gene*)—Greek with Greek, Greek with barbarian, and barbarian with Greek. We can see a parallel in the nations whom the Persians lord it over today; they have been split up and then horribly jumbled together again into the scattered communities in which they now live." Such views assume that the best life is one in a small, ethnically homogeneous city in which the inhabitants are in concord about political affairs.

Many negative and stereotypical portrayals of foreigners are to be found in the tragedians and the philosophers of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Euripides (ca. 485–406 B.C.) is particularly skillful at portraying and manipulating the common attitudes of his audiences. The Thracian king Polymnestor in *Hecuba*, for instance, presents the audience with a catalogue of stereotypical barbarian vices: he is avaricious, equivocal in his allegiance, and thoroughly mendacious. Thoas in *Iphigeneia in Taurus* and Theoclymenus in *Helen* share many vices with Polymnestor. Hall has suggested (1989, 107) that Euripides invented all three kings "precisely in order to provide an opportunity for exploring vices stereotypically imputed to the barbarian character." Other barbarian characters in Euripides represent undesirable extremes. Medea, for instance, epitomizes intemperance, the Phrygian slave in *Orestes* cowardice. The self-serving function of such stereotypes is often apparent, as, for instance, when Achilles says in Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis* (lines 1400–1401), "It is right and reasonable that Greeks should rule over barbarians and not barbarians over Greeks; for these are slaves and those free." It is not necessary to the point here to suggest that Euripides or the other playwrights were themselves strongly prejudiced against foreigners;²⁹ merely that their stereotypical barbarian characters reflect common attitudes of their society.

Not even Aeschylus' *Persians* is as sympathetic a portrayal of the Greeks' enemies as is sometimes claimed. Xerxes is depicted as so devastated by the defeat at Salamis, even after his return to Susa weeks later, that he indulges in beating his breast and tearing his hair. The Athenian audience would surely have regarded this behavior as intemperate and womanish (Hall, 1993, 120; Holst-Warhaft, 1992, 130–133) and therefore reprehensible in a Greek ruler.³⁰ Xerxes' excessive grief and the demoralization of the Persian court also serves to exaggerate the importance of the defeat to the Persians, presumably in order to play up the glories won

by the Greeks. In reality, in 472 B.C., when the play was performed, Xerxes was still comfortably in control of the largest, wealthiest, and best organized empire the world had yet known.³¹ The *Persians* also reinforces the stereotype of barbarians as incapable of understanding the gods and their messages (Georges, 1994, ch. 4).

Although comedy is harder to interpret, it is probably significant that non-Greeks, who are frequently brought on stage, are never presented in a positive light in the fifth century B.C. (Long, 1986, ch. 6). As in tragedy, barbarian characters in comedy represent a catalogue of faults and vices. One thinks especially, for instance, of the lust and stupidity of the Skythian archer in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*.

Plato (429–347 B.C.) employs stereotypes of barbarians on occasion, as, for instance, when he has Socrates say in the *Republic* (435e–436a) that the Phoenicians and Egyptians are characterized by a love of money (as opposed to the Greeks' love of knowledge) or (470c) that Greeks and barbarians are enemies by nature. For Aristotle (384–322 B.C.), barbarians are generally similar or identical by nature to slaves and are fit only to be ruled (e.g., *Politics*, 1252a34, where he quotes the line of Achilles in *Iphigeneia in Aulis* mentioned above). The statement in *Politics* 1285a16 is typical of his general assessment: "it is because barbarians are by natural character more slavish than Greeks (and Asiatics than Europeans) that they tolerate master-like rule without resentment." Plutarch, a writer of the first and second centuries A.D., also reports about advice given by Aristotle to Alexander the Great (*Moralia* 329b) that:

Alexander did not do as Aristotle advised—play the part of a leader to the Greeks and of a master to the barbarians, care for the former as friends and kinsmen, and treat the latter as beasts or plants, and so fill his reign with wars, banishments and factions; he behaved alike to all. (translation: Ross, 1952)

A letter surviving in Arabic copies that purports to be from Aristotle to Alexander also recommends that Alexander exile the Persian nobles to Europe, primarily as a matter of revenge (Stern, 1968).³²

It is perhaps not so surprising that otherwise great thinkers like these could have accepted and employed such obviously fallacious stereotypes, if we recall that their ideal societies were based on small cities in which *homonota* (concord or unity of thought) was to be a guiding principle. Both also held typically aristocratic attitudes toward trade and commerce, which was often managed by non-citizens, and wished to keep the ports, with their foreign contagion, on the periphery of their utopias (e.g., Plato, *Laws*, 3, 701–704; Aristotle, *Politics* 1327a11–1327b).

Isocrates (436–338 B.C.) advocated in the *Panegyricus* and elsewhere that the Greeks unite and stop fighting among themselves. This panhellenism, which may seem admirable at first acquaintance, turns out on further analysis to depend on demonization of the Persians, whom he regards as both tyrannical and slavish. Their only conceivable virtue is to provide the Greek cities with a common enemy so that they will stop fighting amongst themselves.

The allegorical references to foreigners in Greek art, particularly sculpture, are also thoroughly chauvinist. Although neither Greeks nor barbarians are generally represented as real-life characters, idealized and heroic Greeks are frequently shown fighting and subduing mythological enemies, such as centaurs (as, e.g., on the west pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia and the metopes of the Parthenon). These mythological enemies enabled the artists to tap into and reinforce the prejudices of their own society without confronting the difficulties of representing real-life people who might evoke a more nuanced response. The political message is especially clear in the case of the Amazons, a frequent opponent, who are not only foreign but also represent an inversion of the normal Greek social order in that they are powerful and self-sufficient women (Tyrrell, 1984). Vase painting reveals a more varied picture, but is increasingly dependent on generalized stereotypes of barbarians or their allegorical surrogates such as giants, centaurs, or Amazons.

Persians are not represented in large numbers in Greek art (Schoppa, 1933), despite the importance of the Persian wars in defining what it was to be a Greek. With a few notable exceptions, such as the famous painting by Polygnotus of the battle of Marathon in the Painted Stoa at Athens (Pausanias, I, 15, 4), Greek artists preferred allegorical allusions to realistic representations of the Persian wars.

EXCEPTIONS TO BARBARIAN STEREOTYPES

Greek views of foreigners were not universally negative. A tendency toward “negative ethnocentrism” (in which dwellers at the edges of the earth are given special respect) can be discerned throughout Greek civilization (Romm, 1992). The Ethiopians of the Homeric poems and the Hyperboreans (dwellers of the far north), Arimaspians and, to some extent, the Skythians of later writers are cases in point. Because of their remoteness and obscurity, the Greeks were free to endow these peoples with utopian characteristics. The “blameless” Ethiopians of the Homeric poems, for instance, are favorites of the gods and the “fortunate” Hyper-

boreans play a role in the foundation legends of both Delphi and Delos (Romm, ch. 2).

Nearer to home, Classical Greek thinkers were dimly aware of the great civilizations that had preceded their own in Egypt and the Near East. They often attribute advancements to Egypt and Babylonia, such as the development of writing, mathematics, and astronomy. In Plato's *Phaedrus* (274c), for instance, Socrates tells a playful story about the invention by the Egyptian god Theuth (Thoth) of “number and calculation, geometry and astronomy...drafts and dice, and above all writing.” Aristotle wrote in *Politics*, 1329b about Egyptian laws and constitutional system, in *Metaphysics*, 1, 1, 981b about the Egyptian foundation of the mathematical arts and in *De Caelo*, 2, 12, 292a about the astronomical observations of the Egyptians and Babylonians, “who have watched the stars from the remotest past, and to whom we owe many incontrovertible facts about each of them.”³³ The Greeks were especially impressed by the antiquity and monuments of Egypt, which they tended to romanticize (Froidefond, 1971).

Notable barbarians, whether semi-legendary (e.g., Anacharsis of Skythia) or historical (e.g., Cyrus I of Persia; see Hirsch, 1985, 72) are mentioned with approval by several Greek writers and Persian emphasis on telling the truth is mentioned by Herodotus (I, 136).³⁴ The Greeks were also free from color prejudice, as already noted; whatever else they felt about African blacks and other dark-skinned people, they did not look down upon them merely on the basis of their color.

Even the Persian invasions of Mainland Greece had a mixed reaction from Greeks in general. We tend to forget that most of the Greek cities of Asia Minor and the Aegean islands served on the Persian side, albeit under considerable pressure. Queen Artemisia of Halicarnassus is said to have fought on behalf of the Persian cause with great distinction (Herodotus, VIII, 87-102).³⁵ On the mainland itself, the Thessalians and Boeotians, including no less a city than Thebes, fought with the Persians at Platea in 179 B.C. against the main body of southern Greeks. Furthermore, although the Spartan defense of the pass at Thermopylae against the Persian invaders is justly famous, the Spartans at other times often pursued pro-foreign, including pro-Persian, policies. During the later stages of the Peloponnesian war, for instance, they entered into an alliance against Athens with Darius II and received substantial sums of money for expeditions against Athens (Lewis, 1977) and they promoted and signed the peace of Antalcidas in 386 B.C., which left Asia Minor in the hands of the Persians. There are, consequently, other sides to the

story of Greek-barbarian relations, even in the case of the Persians, although they were hardly given a sympathetic hearing in the literary tradition because of Athens' domination of Greek intellectual and artistic activity in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.

Herodotus was notably judicious in his treatment of non-Greeks. Despite the centrality of the antithesis of Greek and barbarian to his organizing theme (the Greco-Persian wars; see I, 1), his detailed portrayal of foreigners is often sympathetic and free of negative stereotypes. He sees both as subject to the same interplay of divine and human forces, with similar, often disastrous results. He often points to foreign influences on Greek arts (e.g., V, 58, writing) and religious customs (e.g., II, 50-60). In some instances he goes too far in giving foreigners credit; he maintains erroneously, for instance, that the Greeks learned "the names of nearly all the gods" from the Egyptians (II, 50), as well as the transmigration of the soul after death (II, 123).³⁶ Herodotus also sometimes falls prey to the usual Greek stereotypes as, for instance, when he writes (I, 60) that: "the Greek nation has been distinguished from old times from the barbarian in being more clever and free from foolish gullibility." The extent to which Herodotus' general attitude ran counter to the usual stereotypes is clear from his later stigmatization by Plutarch (*On the Malice of Herodotus*, 12) as a "barbarian-lover" (*philobarbaros*). It is possible that his sympathy for barbarians arose in part from his experiences as a native of Halicarnassus in Caria, a region of considerable ethnic intermixture; one scholar has even described Herodotus himself as a "mestizo" (Georges, 1994, 139).

In a few instances Classical thinkers express views that seem to approximate a belief in human equality. A fragmentary text of the fifth-century B.C. writer Antiphon, for instance, is worth quoting:

The laws of our neighbors we know and revere; the laws of those who live afar we neither know nor revere. Thus in this we have been made barbarians with regard to one another. For by nature we are all in all respects similarly endowed to be barbarian or Greeks. One may consider those natural facts which are necessary in all men and provided for all in virtue of the same faculties and in these very matters none of us is separated off as a barbarian or as a Greek. For we all breathe into the air by way of our mouths and noses, we laugh when we are happy in our minds and we cry when we are in pain, we receive sounds by our hearing and we see by our eyes with light, we work with our hands and we walk on our feet ...

(as translated in Hall, 1989, 218-219)

Antiphon's point is that humans are by nature (*i.e.*, physically) on equal terms and that Greeks and barbarians are distinguished from one another by "laws." *Nomos*, the Greek word for "law," includes much that we would call "culture" in English.³⁷ Although the emphasis on the physical similarity of Greeks and barbarians suggests that the Greeks might have conceived and developed more inclusive and egalitarian concepts of human worth than they did, we should recall that they were not generally impressed by biological similarities or differences, as opposed to cultural and intellectual ones. On the other hand, the concept that it is through lack of reverence for the laws of distant cultures that "we are made barbarians with regard to one another" (*i.e.*, that we have become barbarians in one another's eyes) is noteworthy in that it may also suggest that culture is arbitrary. In general, however, Antiphon's views here appear to be essentially descriptive and the extent to which they would have carried a moral judgment is not clear.³⁸ Although other fifth- and fourth-century sophists such as Hippias advanced somewhat similar views (Guthrie, 1969, 118-120, 160-163, 280-285; Garland, 1988, 119-126; Hall, 1989, 215-216), the effect on mainstream attitudes was probably slight. The stereotypes continued to be portrayed and there no evidence of any widespread effort to accept foreigners as equals.³⁹

Greek thinkers occasionally voiced the view that particular cultural practices were relative to the characteristics of particular ethnic groups. For example, Xenophanes wrote that "each *ethnos* depicts the shapes of the gods as similar to their own, the Ethiopians making them dark and snub-nosed, the Thracians red-haired and blue-eyed" (Diels and Kranz, 1951-1952, I, 133, fragment 16). Xenophanes' point, however, was that all cultures misunderstood the true nature of divinity, not that the cultures of individual groups were of equal value (see the fragments of his writings as set forth, for instance, in Barnes, 1987, 93-99). Herodotus (III, 38) wrote that "everyone believes his own native customs and the religion he was brought up in to be the best" and gives an amusing example of Greeks being horrified at the idea of eating their dead, whereas the *Callatiai*, a people of India who did in fact eat their dead, were equally horrified at the thought of burning them like the Greeks. Although in this and similar passages Herodotus gives the impression that he was a cultural relativist, he was probably merely documenting interesting examples of the diversity of culture. Despite his often positive views of barbarians (see above), he does not dispute the more general Greek assumption that life in a Greek *polis* was better than other possible arrangements.

The Cynic school of philosophy is of possible relevance here, since it provides another exception to the attitude that culture is more important than biology. The school's nominal founder, the "sophist" Antisthenes (ca. 450–360 B.C.), appears to have expressed indifference to established laws in favor of the pursuit of individual virtue.⁴⁰ Cynic doctrine, as further developed by Diogenes (ca. 400–325 B.C.), explicitly stated that cultural differences were merely conventional and that it was humankind's natural qualities, in particular their physical/biological similarities, that were of overriding importance (fragments in Diogenes Laertius, VI, 2). This approach led to the denial of the importance of the city in favor of the whole world (*kosmos*) as the appropriate home for the wise man. As a result, however, Cynics avoided, and even derided normal civic activities and their doctrines had no widespread popular following.

Xenophon provides another alternative to the generally hostile picture of Persians in most Greek sources. He developed considerable respect for the customs and imperial organization of the Persians as a result of his service as a mercenary commander under Cyrus II in 401 B.C. and its aftermath. His *Cyropaedia* (the upbringing of Cyrus I) presents Persia favorably and reasonably accurately (Hirsch, 1985), although in an epilogue at the end, and elsewhere in his writings he displays less positive attitudes. Xenophon's favorable attitude toward barbarians is largely restricted to the Persians, however, and is largely due to his admiration for their aristocratic virtues.

Whether Alexander the Great conceived the idea of the essential unity of all peoples, or planned to fuse the Macedonian and Persian aristocracies into a new ruling class, is much disputed (Hirsch, 1985, 146 and notes; Rotroff, this volume). He might have been inspired to pursue such policies in part as a reaction to the Greek tendency to stigmatize the Macedonians themselves as *barbaroi* by those whose membership in the Greek *ethnos* were beyond doubt (see, e.g., Herodotus, V, 22 and VIII, 137; Demosthenes, *Philippics*, *Olynthiacs*, *passim*). In the event, in any case, his plans did not survive his death. The Hellenistic kingdoms that succeeded Alexander's empire, despite some cultural intermixture between Greeks and non-Greeks (Rotroff, this volume), were dominated by a Greek ruling class (see, e.g., Walbank, 1993, 65–66). "The tacit assumption in Alexandria and Antioch, just as much as in Athens, was the superiority of Greek language and manners" (Momigliano, 1975, 7). Although there were attempts to assimilate and "hellenize" the natives, they did not aim to establish political and economic equality between

Greeks and non-Greeks, at least in Egypt and the better documented centers of the Seleucid empire.

The Hellenistic intellectual climate was more open than the Classical to the concept of general human qualities that override ethnic categories. Eratosthenes (ca. 275–194 B.C.), for instance, is reported by Strabo (I, 4, 9) to have disapproved of those who divided humankind into Greeks and barbarians and those who advised Alexander to treat the Greeks as friends and the barbarians as enemies on the grounds that "it is better to make such divisions according to good and bad qualities. For many Greeks are bad and many barbarians refined, for instance the Indians and the Arians, and, further, the Romans and Carthaginians, who govern themselves so admirably." The trends toward less ethnocentric attitudes are best represented by Stoic philosophy, which was also remarkable in that its founder, Zeno, was from Cyprus rather than Aegean Greece. Zeno may even have been regarded in antiquity as Phoenician rather than Greek (Preus, this volume). Stoicism was admirable in its belief in the "brotherhood of man," an idea that was foreshadowed by Antiphon and the sophists and that has continued to have great influence. On the other hand, since Stoicism stressed individual experience and responsibility and called for acceptance of whatever fate brings, it did not lead its adherents to take active positions on day-to-day social issues. Neither Stoicism nor other beliefs in the unity of humankind as enunciated by philosophers of the Roman period (Baldry, 1961, 194–195) and implicit in Christianity and other religions of the first millennium A.D. were sufficient to lead to effective calls for social change in antiquity.

WAS GREEK ETHNOCENTRISM JUSTIFIED?

So far, this essay has been mainly descriptive of Greek dealings with and attitudes toward foreigners. Let me now attempt to suggest some of the reasons that these practices and attitudes took the form that they did and to point the way to some value judgments about them. I believe it appropriate, and even desirable, for us to try to make independent and reasoned moral judgments about other cultures, whether ancient or modern.⁴¹ Such judgments are especially appropriate in the case of ethnocentrism, which has a long history in western civilization and has contributed greatly to the excesses of ethnic prejudice and racism.

As we have seen, Greek ethnocentrism flourished from early times, despite the many and various contacts between Greeks and foreigners. Such contacts were a necessity, since the Greek way of life depended on

the almost inexhaustible supply of grain, raw materials and labor that "barbarians" provided. Given the complexity and subtlety of the interrelationships between Greeks and non-Greeks, we must ask ourselves why the Classical Greeks felt themselves superior to all other peoples and chose to emphasize so strongly the stereotypes of barbarians as slavish, despotic, cruel, corrupt, and so on.

At the outset, one should probably emphasize the psychological power of military superiority. The Greek hoplite system of warfare, which consisted in massing heavily armored men (*hoplites*) in disciplined ranks (the *phalanx* formation) was developed in the eighth century or the early seventh century B.C. as a concomitant of the *polis*. It proved enormously successful as Greek colonies spread out throughout the Mediterranean world. Greek troops soon came to be prized as mercenaries by foreign monarchs (Parke, 1933; cf. Boardman, 1980, *passim*). At sea, the Greek trireme became the predominant war vessel by the time of the Persian wars. Greeks would have been able to conquer the known world long before the time of Alexander had they been unified in a national state.⁴²

I have already stressed the Greek belief in the superiority of their own culture and intellect. Native Greek cultural snobbery was reinforced by almost complete lack of interest in the great wealth of the ancient Near Eastern written traditions. Although they would not generally have had access to official records, the many Greek travelers abroad would have seen numerous less formal documents and inscriptions on monuments. These would give indications of the great cultural and political complexity of the ancient Near East, with its law codes, elaborate religious documents, and intricate interrelationships between cities or regions. Yet there is almost no evidence to suggest that Greeks read other languages and we do not hear of a single translation into Greek of a literary work of Egypt or Mesopotamia before the Hellenistic period. The fifth-century B.C. sophist Hippias is the only Classical Greek I know of who claimed to have read "barbarian" authors (Diels and Kranz, 1951-1952, II, 331, fragment 6). Even in the oral sphere, there was no emphasis in Greek culture on the learning of other languages. Blunders in the text of Herodotus, for instance, such as his regarding the Persian god Mithra as female and synonymous with Aphrodite (I, 131), demonstrate clearly that his acquaintance with foreign languages was slight, despite the importance of barbarians to his theme. The great literature of the Near East, which was copied and embellished for millennia in Mesopotamia,⁴³ probably had a significant influence on the Homeric poems and Hesiod in the

eighth and seventh centuries B.C. (West, 1988, 169-172; Burkert, 1992), but even this was mainly by word of mouth.⁴⁴ Subsequent Greek literature shows much less outside influence. The Greeks' lack of interest in the languages and literature of their eastern neighbors is especially striking in the light of their own cultural emphasis on language and writing.⁴⁵

The Greek class-system, with its focus on an elite male ruling class, was another factor that led Greeks to devalue foreigners, since those they most often came in contact with were metics, who were generally of lower status, or slaves. The class system in Greece was coupled with a very limited concept of freedom. Freedom for elite males required a corresponding lack of freedom for the rest of society. This was true even, or rather especially, in the democratic city states. In Athens, for instance, women became increasingly more subordinated and slavery more widespread as the political system became more democratic (for male citizens) in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. Athenian democracy was a viable political system only because the leisured male citizens were supported by a huge underclass of women, metics and slaves.

Dependence on slavery was, in my view, the most important factor in Greek attitudes toward foreigners. Although slavery in one form or another was a common practice in the ancient world, it was particularly pervasive in Greece. Since the evidence suggests that slaves were treated little if at all better in Greece than in the Southern United States, the practice of slavery can hardly be regarded as beneficial to the slaves themselves. Although statistical data is lacking for the ancient world and quantitative comparisons cannot be pursued, such a judgment is supported by much qualitative evidence. Just as in the United States, for instance, slaves in ancient Greece were considered property to be used and abused at the will of their masters. Slave families had no legal standing (children were regarded as the property of the master) and there is evidence to suggest that families were not kept together when slaves were sold. They could be, and often were, used for sexual purposes, chained or fettered, beaten, tortured (a requirement if they gave legal testimony at Athens) and branded. Although slaves might buy their freedom, or be granted it by their master, manumission was often conditional: children born before manumission, for instance, were the legal property of the master and manumitted slaves were often legally required to continue to serve their former masters. Slaves in the United States may even have been better off in some respects; for instance, they probably lived more often in their own cabins and quarters than their ancient counterparts and thus had more opportunities to maintain their own separate

culture and their families were more often kept together (see, e.g., Walvin, 1983, especially 82-98; Kolchin, 1993, ch. 5). On the plus side for Greece, domestic and skilled slaves probably received better treatment than the rest and were even able on occasion to operate with some independence. The "Old Oligarch," writing about 430 B.C., complains that slaves in Athens were indistinguishable in appearance from citizens or metics (Garlan, 1988, 147-148), although his words must be taken with a grain of salt. The building records of 408-407 B.C. for the Erechtheum on the acropolis at Athens show that slaves, metics, and free men worked together and received roughly the same wage (Garlan, 1988, 65, 72); one must note, however, that such artisan-slaves would have remitted part of their wages to their owners, so that they were hardly in the position of complete equals.

Stereotypes of "barbarians," like later stereotypes of "the negro," served the interests of slave holding by providing an intellectual framework in which these "outsiders" could be considered not quite human and therefore could be treated with less regard than other members of the society. As long as slaves could be regarded as inferior in nature, their owners were relieved of both responsibility and guilt for treating them inhumanely.

Another reason that the stereotypes of the barbarian were so extreme was that Greek thinkers tended to emphasize antitheses: the barbarian as defined in fifth-century Athens was the antithesis of the Athenian state and its citizens. Since the Greek ideals were wisdom (*sophia*), manliness/courage (*andreia*), discipline/restraint (*sophrosune*), and justice (*dikaiosune*), barbarians were pictured as stupid, cowardly, cruel, unrestrained, and lawless. Their lack of discipline is often represented in the form of an addiction to refinement and luxury, a stereotype that carries the further stigma of effeminacy. And, since Athens prided itself on its devotion to democracy and freedom of speech, barbarian society was pictured as one of tyrants and fawning subjects who dared not speak their mind.

The Persian wars played a major role in the widespread adoption and reiteration of these negative stereotypes, since barbarians in the form of Persians were the ostensible *raison-d'être* of the Athenian empire, the nominal aim of which was to drive the Persians out of the Aegean and liberate all Greek cities that were under their sway. I'm not trying to deny that the Persians were a real threat to the autonomy and prosperity of the mainland Greek cities in the early fifth century B.C., nor that the Athenians demonstrated great courage in leading the fight against them. But by the

mid-fifth century, if not earlier, the Persian threat to mainland Greece had receded and the Greek world was left more or less as it had been since before the rise of Lydia in the seventh century B.C. From then on the Athenians concerned themselves primarily with consolidation of their empire and with their rivalry with Sparta, which culminated in the Peloponnesian war of 431-404 B.C. Even though Persia had ceased to pose much military threat to the Greeks, references to the Persians and their stigmatization as evil barbarians continued to be highly useful as a propaganda device for keeping the subject cities in line. During the Cold War, and more recently the Gulf war, Americans have had first-hand experience of the power of such demonization of the enemy to rally citizenry and allies.

Was the Persian empire as evil as Greek sources suggest? On the contrary, it could easily be judged to be a highly successful large-scale organization that led to peace and prosperity for many of its subject peoples. The main aim of the Persian satraps (governors) in the provinces was to generate revenue for the central authority and for themselves; they usually interfered as little as possible with local social and religious customs, although naturally they tended to promote monarchs and oligarchies that furthered their collection of taxes without hindrance. Except for the problems on the Greek frontier, the Persian empire seems to have run pretty smoothly and successfully during the later sixth and fifth centuries B.C. and it was only in the later fourth century B.C. that serious corruption set in (Young, 1988). In general, therefore, the Persian empire was not particularly evil as empires go. The Greek kingdoms of the Hellenistic period, which inherited various parts of the Persian empire, hardly did better by their subject peoples.

The Greeks regularly portrayed the Persians and other barbarian peoples as cruel (Hall, 1989, 158-159). But did the Persians in fact behave more brutally than the Greeks? The nature of the evidence prevents such comparisons from being analyzed statistically. For what it is worth, however, one can find mention of Greek atrocities that seem to me to be the equal of those ascribed to the Persians. For example, the Greek and Carian mercenaries defending Egypt against the Persians slaughtered the sons of Phanes, another mercenary, in front of their lines in view of their father because their father had gone over to the Persians (Herodotus, III, 11); Arcesilaus of Cyrene burnt political opponents alive in a tower (Herodotus, IV, 164); many terrible killings occurred during the civil war in Coreya in 427 B.C. (Thucydides, III, 81). Greeks also sometimes carried out mass executions of captives in war; for instance, the Spartans put to death 200 Plataeans and 25 Athenians after the siege of 429-427 B.C.

(Thucydides, III, 68) and the Athenians executed all the men of military age captured in Melos in 415 B.C. (Thucydides, V, 116; cf. their initial decision in the case of Mytilene, Thucydides, III, 36). It is pointless to multiply further such examples. Suffice to say that the evidence does not justify the Greek stereotypes of "barbarians" on the grounds that the Greeks behaved less brutally than most other ancient or modern people.⁴⁶

Did Greek, and specifically Athenian, society live up to the ideals of freedom that were promulgated by means of this barbarian antithesis? The Athenian empire is an easy target of criticism, since few would praise it without qualification.⁴⁷ Like Persia, Athens demanded tribute and loyalty from its subjects and was just as ruthless in dealing with those that revolted, such as Thasos (Thucydides, I, 100), Euboea (Thucydides, I, 114), Samos (Thucydides, I, 115-117), and Mytilene (Thucydides, III, 2-50), or with neutrals who got in its way, such as Melos (Thucydides, V, 84-116). In such cases, freedom was conceived as the prerogative of the dominant city-state in a league or alliance.

Was Greek democracy, to move to a more difficult question, so truly democratic as to justify the stereotypes of its "barbarian" neighbors as unfree and slavish?⁴⁸ Of course, the Athenians deserve the highest praise for being the first to enunciate democratic principles and, what is more, for putting them into practice as far as they did. But we should not be blind to the details of their version of democracy. To illustrate this point, consider an analogy with the Southern United States before the civil war. The economies of both societies were similar in that they were largely controlled by a land-owning aristocracy and were dependent on slave-labor. In both Athens and the Southern United States the vote was restricted to a relatively small group of men. In Classical Athens, for instance, some 30,000 Athenian men had the franchise out of a total population of at least 120,000.⁴⁹ In the Southern States, the vote was similarly confined to propertied male citizens, and denied to women, slaves and the poor. If, like me, you regard the society of the ante-bellum South as blameworthy in so severely restricting political participation and the distribution of opportunities and goods to its members, it would seem to follow that you should regard the society of ancient Athens as similarly blameworthy.⁵⁰

It is also striking that in ancient Athens, as in the contemporary United States, only a small proportion of those eligible actually voted. Those attending meetings of the assembly before the third quarter of the fourth century B.C. regularly numbered about 6000, as is attested both by the physical limitations of the space where assemblies took place on the

hill of the Pnyx and the figure of 6000 attested for a quorum.⁵¹ Hence, using the most favorable estimates (*i.e.*, a citizen body of 20,000 and 8000 participants—assuming some were standing), no more than 40% of the eligible citizen body ever participated in any particular decision. Usually, the number was probably no more than a third of those eligible.⁵² We may therefore conclude, again using the most favorable estimates (*i.e.*, 8000 voters of a total population of 120,000), that those actually voting on any particular occasion in "democratic" Athens of Classical times would never have represented more than seven percent of the total population.

It is difficult to separate Greek treatment of foreigners from the larger context of Greek society and I have ranged widely in trying to sketch some grounds on which value judgments might be made about ancient Greek stereotypes of foreigners. In conclusion, I would like to return to the question of the appropriateness of making such judgments. I think that we do, in fact, make judgements that we hardly recognize ourselves as making. Those acquainted with Greek literature tend to take the Greek perspective so much for granted that it colors their views of alternatives. Borza writes (1973, 22), for instance, "of the continuing corruption of classical studies by sentimental philhellenism (a major flaw in Western scholarship)." We forget that our picture of the relationship between Greeks and non-Greeks is almost completely one-sided, since the views of foreigners living in Greece or coming into contact with Greeks have rarely survived. We would surely have a less benevolent impression of Greek slavery than we do if direct testimony from the slaves themselves existed like that from slaves in the Southern United States. What do most Europeans or Americans know about the Persians, except that they were the dastardly opponents of a free Greece, a picture that comes solely from Greek sources?⁵³ As Purdy points out in her contribution to this book, the "European canon" of recent educational debate is not neutral in value or independent of political forces, and it behooves us to be aware of its tendentious nature.

My subject has led me to take a rather unsympathetic view of one aspect of Greek thought. If I have chosen to put matters plainly and in strong terms, it is not from a desire to bash the Greeks, but because I believe we must strive for a balanced assessment of their achievements. Since ancient Greece continues to provide a model for European social and ethical values, we ought closely to examine all aspects of ancient Greek society, not just those which we approve. Greek ethnocentric stereotypes, in particular, cry out for detailed analysis and critical judg-

ment because they continue to have a deleterious influence on "western" assumptions of racial and cultural superiority. People of European descent ought especially to be aware of the powerful role that ethnocentrism played in ancient Greek life and the distortions it led to in ancient Greek and later European thought.

NOTES

1. The word "ethnocentric" is, of course, of modern coinage, but it is based on two ancient Greek words, *ethnos* ("nation," see below) and *kentron* ("center of a circle," etc.). The Microsoft Bookshelf 94 Dictionary defines it as: "1. Belief in the superiority of one's own ethnic group. 2. Overriding concern with race." There are good grounds for seeing ethnocentrism as a bad thing because it relies on and propagates national and ethnic stereotypes and leads people to deny or ignore the value of individuals and their actions. For insightful discussions of ethnicity, ethnocentrism and ethnic stereotypes and their relevance for ancient Greece, see especially Hall, 1989 and 1996, 334-336 and references there cited. Hall notes (1989, 102-103) that the concept of a "stereotype" was first used in a psychological sense by Walter Lippmann in 1922.

I should disclose at the outset my tendency to sympathize with "barbarians" and others outside the cultural mainstream, no doubt due in part to my having lived in the U.S.A. as a resident alien for twenty years (I was born and raised in Canada). I also, however, have great respect for the ancient Greeks, whom I have been studying for most of my life, and I regard my present analytic approach as a mark of my respect toward their achievements. I don't think scholars need fear that discussion of the less positive characteristics of ancient peoples will cause the public to take any less notice of them. On the contrary, to judge by my experience in the classroom, most people find Greek civilization more interesting when all its aspects are up for discussion.

My topic has turned out to be much more ambitious than I imagined when I put myself down for it at the time of the Cornell conference in April, 1993 and I cannot claim expertise in all the relevant areas and disciplines. I benefited greatly from the discussions at the original conference and at a seminar at the University of Ottawa in October, 1993 where I presented an early version of this essay. I am also very grateful to the following for reading and commenting on various drafts: Charles Brittain, Margaret Buchmann, Gordon Kirkwood, Robert Lamberton, Laura Purdy, Jeffery Rusten, Susan Rotroff, Iakovos Vasiliou, Clark Walz and several anonymous scholars. Julia Annas also pointed me toward some relevant bibliography on Aristotle. Although written and oral comments have saved me from many errors and led me to reconsider and temper many details, I am solely responsible both for specific interpretations and the general stance here adopted. I have great-

ly profited from Edith Hall's book *Inventing the Barbarian* and my point of view coincides closely with hers, particularly concerning the dangers of ethnic stereotypes. Martin Bernal has also been an inspiration for me in his willingness in *Black Athena* and elsewhere to explore questions of racism.

2. Cf. Said's discussion of Orientalism (1979), which, he argues (12) "...is—and does not simply represent—a considerable dimension of modern political intellectual culture, and as such has less to do with the Orient than it does with 'our' world."
3. I use the word "ethnicity" in the sense of subjective ethnicity (i.e., having to do with people's attitudes rather than biology), as discussed by Hall (1989, 3; 1996, 336).
4. Stoicism, with its emphasis on the "brotherhood of mankind," was an welcome exception to the general intellectual trend; see below on Exceptions to Barbarian Stereotypes.
5. Although these relationships are of great interest, especially for the light they throw on the workings of trade and colonization, they were of less importance in the formation of Greek attitudes as they have come down to us than Greek relations with their eastern neighbors. For a summary of Greeks and Etruscans, see Boardman, 1980, 198-210.
6. It is, of course, likely, given the division of Classical Greece into hundreds of autonomous and widely dispersed city-states, that at one time or another some Greeks had less negative attitudes toward foreigners than those attested in our written sources. Archaeology can sometimes throw a valuable light on the interactions of such ordinary people, as Rotroff suggests elsewhere in this volume. Yet she is writing about the Hellenistic period, when, as just noted, relationships were more complex and popular attitudes may have had a greater range.
7. Still later, during the time that Greece fell under the sway of the Romans, it was divided into two provinces, Achaia and Macedonia, and it did not achieve its modern status as an independent country until 1821.
8. Hall, 1989, 6 reviews the various possibilities and their supporters.
9. The word could also be used for major subdivisions of the Greek people such as the Dorians or Ionians (groups united primarily by their common dialect, but also by geography). Other, smaller, regional subdivisions of the Greek people (Thessalians, Phocians, Lokrians, Boeotians, Athenians, Lacedaemonians, etc.) were sometimes also referred to as *ethne*.
10. The root of *barbaros* occurs twice in compound words in the Homeric poems: *barbarophonos* ("barbarian speaking") is used of the Carians in *Iliad* 2, 867 and *Abarbaros* ("Not-barbarian") is used of a nymph of Asia Minor in *Iliad* 6, 21. Although the poetic conventions of the Homeric poems did not encourage mention of the existence of languages other than Greek, there are a few exceptions. In *Odyssey* 8, 294, for instance, the Siotians in Lemnos are

called "of wild speech" (*agriophonoi*) and in *Iliad* 4, 437-438 it is said of the Trojans (and their allies) that "they had no common speech (*throos*) or language (*gerys*), but they were of mixed speech and had been called forth from many lands." The Lemnian Sintians were later called "mixed Greek-barbarians"; see the fragment of Hellanicus cited below.

11. Note that Thucydides does not here imply that the Greeks did not think of themselves as a people in Homeric times, merely that they had no common name for themselves.
12. I do not think it likely, as is sometimes stated (e.g., Lefkowitz, 1996, 10), that the word *barbaros* derived from Babylonian *barbaru*, despite the similarity of sound. It is difficult to imagine how the Babylonian word would have been transmitted and the coincidence can be explained by the similarity in the way that people react to unfamiliar sounds.
13. Archaeology suggests that in earlier times speakers of Greek, who were restricted to the mainland of Greece (from Thessaly southwards) in the first half of the second millennium B.C., had gradually increased their territory. The Mycenaean Greeks gradually expanded their settlements and/or political control to include the Cycladic islands, Crete, Rhodes, and parts of Asia Minor. From ca. 1100-750 B.C., a time of general disturbance and recession of material culture throughout the Mediterranean, Greeks established colonies in Cyprus and immigrated in large numbers into Asia Minor, where they founded (or refounded) many famous cities, such as Smyrna, Ephesos and Miletos.
14. Strabo (3, 4, 8), for instance, recounted about the city of Emporion (now Ampurias) in Spain that the Greek settlers eventually united with the native barbarians and that their constitution was a mixture of Greek and barbarian laws, "a thing which has taken place in the case of many other peoples." That there was considerable intermarriage is suggested by the occasional references to mixed Greek-foreign peoples; for instance, the island of Lemnos had a mixed Greek-Thracian population (Hellanicus, fragment 71a in Jacoby, 1923, 125), the inhabitants of Cedreiae in Caria are said to have been a Greek-barbarian mixture (*mixobarbaroi*) by Xenophon (*Hellenika*, 2, 1, 15), and a Greek-Skythian people is mentioned by Herodotus (IV, 17). Probable Greek citizens with "barbarian" names also occur: *Skythes* ("the Skythian"), for instance, is the name of rulers at Zankle and Cos (Herodotus, VI, 23-24, VII, 163); *Brentes*, *Paibes*, and *Smordos* are found in Thrace and *Alazir* at Barca (Jeffery, 1976, 57 and references on 59). See the many papers in Descoeudres, 1990.
15. Prejudice against marriage with native women is shown by Herodotus' disparaging comments about the Ionian colonists of Asia Minor (I, 146): "Even those who started out from the Government House (*prytaneion*) in Athens and believe themselves to be of the purest Ionian blood, took no women with them but married Carian ones, whose parents they had killed.

The fact that these women were forced into marriage after the murder of their fathers, husbands and sons was the origin of the law, established by oath and passed down to their female descendants, forbidding them to sit at table with their husbands or address them by name." Just before this passage, Herodotus disparages claims of the leading Ionian cities to purity of Ionian blood on the grounds that the colonists came from all over Greece.

16. Thucydides, 7, 27. Although this number cannot be regarded as precise, it is probably accurate in its general order of magnitude. Since Thucydides also notes there that the majority of the deserting slaves were skilled workmen (*cheirotechnai*), we may conclude that the total number of slaves in Athens, which would have included many domestic and agricultural workers, was much higher.
17. In Classical times a skilled worker might receive a drachma or two a day.
18. Except in the case of blacks, the ethnic origin of most of the many slaves depicted in pottery and funerary sculpture cannot be distinguished. For discussions of slaves in art, see Himmelmann, 1971 and Kolendo, 1979.
19. For perfume and clothing see Long, 1986, 75-91. For silk see the report on several items of silk found in a grave at the Kerameikos in Athens of the later fifth century B.C. in Hundt (1969); the excavators suggest that the grave might have been that of the famous statesman and general Alcibiades (e.g., Knigge, 1991, 109-110). Hundt also publishes in the same article a fragment of a garment of silk from a sixth-century B.C. chieftain's grave at Hohmichele in southwestern Germany. The embroidered pattern of this garment has obvious Greek parallels. Perhaps silk reached Greece as thread and was exported as finished garments; Strabo, 11, 2, 3 mentions Greek exports of cloth (cited in Wiedemann, 1988, 107-108).
20. Cinnamon and cassia, its bark, are mentioned by Herodotus (III, 106-112) as coming from Arabia; they actually come from India, a fact that may have been concealed by the Indian and Arabian suppliers (see Casson, 1974, 60). For pepper, see Long, 1986, 73.
21. The general view of Mackie seems to be in direct contradiction to the evidence she so carefully assembles about the differences between the Greeks and the Trojans. She states (1996, 9-10), for instance, that "the [*Iliad*] in no obvious way presents a system of beliefs and values that privileges Greeks over foreigners."
22. Rihll, 1993, makes a strong case that war served as, and was regarded as, a mode of production by the ancient Greeks.
23. Wine drinking was generally a sign of civilization for the Greeks. But immoderate drinking, and particularly the drinking of wine unmixed with water, which Herodotus ascribes to the Skythians (VI, 81), was considered inappropiate. Herodotus (I, 133) also describes the Persians as getting drunk as a regular part of the decision making process, surely meaning to imply that

this was a mark of their barbarity.

24. As witnessed, for instance, by the words put in the mouth of a carpenter named Charon by the poet Archilochus in the seventh century B.C.: "I pay no mind to the wealth of gold-rich Gyges:/ envy's never taken hold of me./ I've no longing for the works of gods./ I don't ask for a great tyranny./ All of this is simply beyond my horizon" (West, 1989, 8, fragment 19). Herodotus (I, 26-92) pictures Croesus as so blinded by *hubris* that he was unable to understand the true meaning of advice from the Greek sage Solon or of a famous oracle from Delphi.
25. The derivation of the word Europe is disputed. The word can be taken to mean "broad face or gaze" in Greek, a meaning that is consistent with the hypothesis that it originated in Greece as a geographical term, perhaps as applied to the plains of Boeotia and Thessaly. In the lexicographer Hesychius (sixth century A.D.), on the other hand, *europa* is glossed as "land of sunset, or dark one" and this definition has encouraged modern scholars to derive it from the Semitic *rb*, "sunset or west" (Astour, 1967, 128-131; Burkert, 1992, 2, note 3). Such a derivation is in keeping with the common ancient derivation of the continent of Europe from the Phoenician princess Europa (spelled in Greek Εὐρώπη, exactly as the continent), who was seduced and abducted to Crete by Zeus (for discussion see Astour, 1967, 131-135). Although the connection of place name with Phoenician princess is doubted by Herodotus (IV, 45) on the grounds that Europa never visited "the country now called Europe by the Greeks, but only came from Phoenicia as far as Crete and from Crete to Lycia [in SW Asia Minor]," other sources, like the second century A.D. traveller Pausanias (IX, 19, 1), do have Europa visit mainland Greece.

The division between Europe and Asia, then as now, was the sea route from the Black Sea through the Hellespont (Dardanelles); Europe included most, if not all the Aegean islands, but not, according to Herodotus (IV, 36-40), Asia Minor. The playwrights of the fifth century B.C., on the other hand, tended to extend the boundaries of Greece to include parts of Asia Minor in accordance with contemporary political geography (Hall, 1989, 165-172).
26. The Greeks (e.g., Herodotus II, 16) generally divided the world into three parts, Europe, Asia, and Libya. The latter encompassed roughly what was known of Africa (so named by the Romans), although Herodotus suggests in the passage just cited that Egypt was problematical in that it was sometimes regarded as separate from Libya.
27. They were also unaware of their linguistic kinship with much of Europe, for it was only recognized in the nineteenth century that Greek and most of the other languages spoken in Europe belong to the same language family (Indo-European).
28. Diller (1937, 29) asserts, I think correctly, that Isocrates did not mean here "that barbarians who shared Greek culture should be regarded as Greeks, but

that Greeks who did not share it should be regarded as barbarians."

29. On the contrary, Euripides is sometimes very sympathetic; see, e.g., Guthrie's comments on his sympathies toward slaves (1969, 156-159) and the discussion of "noble barbarians" and "barbaric Greeks" in Hall, 1989, 201-223.
30. Several people have pointed out to me that weeping at a funeral was appropriate behavior for ancient Greek men and cited the case of Achilles in the *Iliad*. But Xerxes' actions seem to me to go beyond even such expanded boundaries for male expression of sorrow.
31. Young, 1988. A poem of Robert Graves (e.g., 1959, 224) about the earlier invasion of Darius, entitled "The Persian Version," is an entertaining counterbalance to the standard Greek perspective of the Persian wars. The first two lines convey the essence of its theme: "Truth-loving Persians do not dwell upon the trivial skirmish fought near Marathon."
32. The harshness of Aristotle's judgment may have been tempered somewhat by his recognition of the possibility that some people who are not natural slaves may be enslaved by force (e.g., *Politics* 1255a3-1255b15). His citing with approval some aspects of the constitution of Carthage in the *Politics* (especially 1272b24-1273b26) and three passages in which he gives the Egyptians and Babylonians credit for early contributions to human knowledge (see below) also suggest the possibility that he might have made some exceptions to his generally pejorative view of barbarians, perhaps for the leisure classes of some barbarian societies. The surviving texts, however, give little evidence that he allowed these other considerations to modify his general anti-barbarian stance.

Aristotle's research into human biology might also have led him to wonder whether barbarians were truly all that different from Greeks (Baldry, 1965, 88-101). One should note, however, that Aristotle was susceptible to great distortions in his picture of human biology as a result of his social preconceptions. His belief in the inferiority of women, for instance, led him to maintain that females made a lesser contribution to procreation than men and that their bodies were colder (*On the Generation of Animals*, 775a5-782a12; cited in Lefkowitz and Fant, 1982, 82-85). In sum, the evidence does not suggest that Aristotle's biological views would have led him to a concept of a "brotherhood of mankind" in the social sphere.
33. These inventions were not, however, universally attributed to foreigners. An alternative Greek tradition held that writing and mathematics were indigenous inventions. Writing and numbers, for instance, were sometimes attributed to Prometheus (e.g., Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound*, 459-460) and writing also to Palamedes (Euripides) or Hermes (Musaeus); for full references see Braun 1982, 29. Plato (especially *Laws*, 3, 677) also wrote of the various inventions of Daedalus, Orpheus, Palamedes, Marsyas, Olympus, Amphion and Epimetheus.
34. One must note, however, that the Greeks did not always regard telling the

truth as a great virtue. The deviousness and lies of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* provided Greeks with a very different cultural model.

35. Herodotus (VII, 99, 2-3; cf. Munson, 1988, 93) clearly meant to identify her as Greek, even though the cities of Caria were of mixed populations.
36. What Herodotus actually meant by his statement that "the names of nearly all the gods came to Greece from Egypt" is in some doubt. There is a well-balanced discussion in Lloyd, 1975-1988, Pt. 2, 203-205. Probably, as Lloyd himself suggests, Herodotus mistakenly thought that the Greek names for the gods were the original ones and that the Egyptian names were merely alternatives or had supplanted the original Greek names. This view is in keeping with the general practice of Herodotus and other Greek writers of giving only the Greek names for divinities in non-Greek lands (see Hall, 1989, 183-184). It is unlikely that Herodotus meant his readers to understand that the divine names in the Greek language were derived from those in the Egyptian language, as Bernal (1987, 51-52) contends, given Herodotus' lack of knowledge of, or interest in, the Egyptian words.

Most scholars hold that the Egyptians did not believe in the transmigration of the soul after death (although Preus argues in this volume that they may have adopted such a belief not long before the time of Herodotus' visit). The Greek belief, as expressed by Pythagorean writers and by Plato, may have been influenced by Buddhism, although there is no direct evidence for such influence.

The extent and significance of foreign influences on Greek civilization is sometimes overemphasized as a result of Herodotus' claims. Bernal (1987, 1991), for example, relies heavily on Herodotus as evidence for his argument that the Greeks recognized that their civilization had "Afro-Asiatic roots." I have elsewhere criticized his concept of what he calls "the ancient model" of invasions and influences on Greek civilization from abroad, as well as his general argument that Greek civilization had "Afro-Asiatic roots" (Coleman, 1996). In fact, the Greeks connected almost all their religious and cultural institutions with Greece itself. Only rarely do they acknowledge foreign contributions, as for instance in the case of writing, mathematics and astronomy. Greek accounts of immigration and invasion from abroad, such as that of Danaus, are cast in mythical terms and are of little value as support for Bernal's position. On closer examination, in any case, the newcomers all turn out to be descended from Greek characters who took up residence abroad; hence, the myths might equally as well be taken to reflect Greek immigration abroad.
37. It was a commonplace in the fourth century B.C. to contrast *nomos* with *physis* (nature), as nowadays we contrast "nature and nurture." Such comparisons, which almost inevitably led to the conclusion that *nomos* was more important than *physis* in human affairs, would have tended to bolster the view that Greeks were superior to others, since as we have noted culture was the most important element in Greek self-definition.
38. A somewhat similar passage in Plato's *Statesman* avoids any value judgment

about the worth of Greeks as opposed to barbarians. Socrates' interlocutor argues (262d-e) that it is inaccurate for the Greeks to lump all barbarians together in contradistinction to themselves. Although this passage might seem to suggest that Plato had reservations about the usual negative valuation of barbarians, particularly since he also uses as an example a possible division setting off Lydians or Phrygians from all other peoples, the dialogue is here concerned with the logical questions of categorization. The point is that non-Greek is not a true subdivision of mankind, but rather that there is a "non-Greek residue" of great diversity.

39. A fragment from an unidentified comedy of Menander (342-291 B.C.) is of possible relevance here. An unknown speaker states that "for me no one is a stranger if he be good. Everybody is of a single nature and it is character that brings about intimacy" (translated from the Greek text in the Loeb edition, p. 504). Unfortunately, we lack information about the dramatic context. Since the word for "stranger" (*allogrios*) suggests only someone outside one's own household, the fragment does not necessarily imply an opinion about non-Greeks.
40. For a convenient discussion see Guthrie, 1969, 304-313. The evidence that Antisthenes was an outsider at Athens because his mother was Thracian is inconclusive. There is, on the other hand, good evidence that he was not an egalitarian (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1284a15; cf. Guthrie's discussion).
41. I do not subscribe to the view that impartial analysis and judgment of past events and cultures is impossible. After all, some values are independent of particular contexts, unless, of course, we believe in cultural relativism, a philosophical position largely discredited (see, e.g., Rachels, 1993, ch. 2). See also below, note 49.
42. Cf. Aristotle, *Politics* 1327b23-34, quoted above.
43. Pritchard, 1950, is a useful compendium. Much more material would have been available in antiquity than has survived to the present.
44. Burkert, 1992, especially 25-33, suggests that there was more than just oral contact, especially in the ways that writing was practiced. However, the lack of surviving translations, or references to translations in our sources, seems to me pretty decisive for the claim that the Greeks knew little or no foreign literature through reading. West, 1988, 171 suggests that the influences were transmitted by "bilingual poets, probably easterners who had settled in Greece and learned to compose epics in the Greek manner."
45. They later showed a similar disinterest in learning Latin; see Momigliano, 1975, 21.
46. It would be wrong to argue in the Greeks' favor that cultured people like Thucydides decried such brutality as exceptional, whereas it as an accepted part of Persian society. Note, for instance, that we lack evidence for the Persians' own reaction to such incidents. A recent summary of the Persian

- empire notes that "Calculated frightfulness was not [an Achaemenid] practice. Deportations were relatively few. Tolerance of local forms of religion, social organization and even government was policy. Documented and orderly provincial government was an imperial goal..." (Young, 1988, 111).
47. Even Thucydides, who supported the imperial policies of Pericles, asserts (II, 8) that at the start of the Peloponnesian war in 431 B.C. "People's feelings were generally on the side of the Spartans, especially as they proclaimed that their aim was the liberation of Hellas....So bitter was the general feeling against Athens, whether from those who wished to escape from her rule or from those who feared that they would come under it."
 48. Cf. Roberts, 1994, who provides a detailed analysis of critiques of Athenian democracy from antiquity to the present.
 49. The evidence for the population of Athens is complex and difficult to interpret and the numbers may have changed considerably between 500 B.C. and the beginning of the Hellenistic era. Except where noted, the figures given in this and the following paragraph represent minimum estimates. For details see Hanson, 1991, 90-94, 130-132 and sources there cited.
 50. Finley, 1983, 9, argues that the limitations of Greek democracy should not be grounds for condemnation, since it is the historian's job to analyze the past, not engage in "a game of awarding credits and demerits according to the historian's own value system." However, if one's aim is to consider the extent to which we should model ourselves after the Greeks, the issues are different. My position here depends on the assumption that reasoned discussion can show us that some political states of affairs are better than others.
 51. Hanson, 1991, suggests that after its modification at the beginning of the fourth century B.C. the space on the Pnyx may have been sufficient for 8000, although fewer could have been seated.
 52. Hansen (1991, 130-132), evidently assuming a larger citizen body than I suggested above, estimates that decisions in the fifth century B.C. were regularly made by only a tenth of the eligible voters; in the fourth century B.C., after pay for service in the assembly was introduced, he estimates the proportion at about one-fifth.
 53. The Persian King Cambyses, portrayed by Herodotus (III, 1-39) as a madman, is here a case in point. After a detailed review of the evidence from the Persian side, Young (1988, 51) concludes: "One begins to suspect that the poor reputation which Cambyses carried into posterity, as recorded by Herodotus...is historically unfair, and may reflect Herodotus' prejudiced sources."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I have cited easily accessible works in English wherever possible. References are also included to English translations of most of the major ancient authors discussed. Greek authors are generally cited, however, by line or section as given in Greek in the Oxford Classical Texts series.

- Aristotle, (1987), *The Politics*, translated by T. A. Sinclair and revised by T. J. Saunders, Harmondsworth.
- (1968), *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, edited by R. McKeon, New York.
- Astour, M. C. (1967), *Hellenosemitica*, Leiden.
- Austin, M. M. (1970), *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age*, Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Suppl. No. 2.
- Baldry, H. C. (1961), "The Idea of the Unity of Mankind," in *Grecs et Barbares*, Vandoeuvres-Genève, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens VIII. 169-195.
- (1965), *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought*, Cambridge.
- Barnes, J. (1987), *Early Greek Philosophy*, Harmondsworth.
- Bernal, M. (1987, 1991), *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*. Vol. I, *The Fabrication of Ancient Greece, 1785-1985*; Vol. II, *The Archaeological and Documentary Evidence*. New Brunswick, N.J.
- Best, J. G. P. (1969), *Thracian Peltasts and their Influence on Greek Warfare*, Groningen.
- Boardman, J. (1974), *Athenian Black Figure Vases*, New York.
- (1980), *The Greeks Overseas*, London.
- Borza, E. N. (1973), "Sentimental Philhellenism and the Image of Greece," in *Classics and the Classical Tradition* (E. N. Borza and R. W. Carrubba, eds.), University Park, Pa., 5-25.
- Braun, T. F. R. G. (1982), "The Greeks in the Near East," in *Cambridge Ancient History* III, Part 3, 1-31.
- Burkert, W. (1985), *Greek Religion*, Cambridge, Mass.
- (1992), *The Orientalizing Revolution*, Cambridge, Mass. and London, Harvard University Press.
- Casson, L. (1974), *Travel in the Ancient World*, London.
- Coleman, J. E. (1996), "Did Egypt Shape the Glory that Was Greece?" In

Black Athena Revisited, M. R. Lefkowitz and G. M. Rogers eds., Chapel Hill and London, University of North Carolina Press, 280-302.

- Cunliffe, B. W. (1988), *Greeks, Romans and Barbarians: Spheres of Interaction*, New York.
- Demosthenes, *Olynthiacs, Philippics, etc.*, with an English translation by J. H. Vince, London and New York, Loeb Classical Library, 1930.
- Descocudres, J.-P. (1990), *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*, Oxford.
- Diels, H., and W. Kranz (1951-1952), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Wiedmann.
- Diller, A. (1937), *Race Mixture among the Greeks before Alexander*, Illinois Studies in Language and Literature XX, Nos. 1-2, Urbana.
- Diodorus Siculus, with an English translation by C. H. Oldfather and F. R. Walton, 12 volumes, London and New York, Loeb Classical Library, 1933-1967.
- Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, with an English Translation by R. D. Hicks, 2 volumes, Cambridge, Mass and London, Loeb Classical Library, 1950.
- Duchène, H. (1986), "Aulus Caprilios Timotheos, Sômatemporos," *BCH* 116, 513-530.
- Finley, M. I. (1977), "Aulos Kaprelios Timotheos, Slave Trader," *Aspects of Antiquity*, Harmondsworth, etc., Penguin Books, ch. 13, 154-166.
- (1979), *The World of Odysseus*, New York.
- (1980), *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology*, New York.
- (1983), *Politics in the Ancient World*, Cambridge.
- Froidefond, C. (1971), *Le Mirage égyptien dans la littérature grecque d'Homère à Aristotele*, Aix-en-Provence.
- Garlan, Y. (1987), "War, Piracy and Slavery in the Greek World," in *Classical Slavery*, M. I. Finley, ed., London and Totowa, 7-21.
- (1988), *Slavery in Ancient Greece*, Ithaca.
- Georges, Pericles (1994), *Barbarian Asia and the Greek Experience*, Baltimore and London.
- Graves, R. (1959), *Collected Poems, 1959*, London.

- Guthrie, W. K. C. (1969), *A History of Greek Philosophy*, Vol. 3, Cambridge.
- Hall, E. (1989), *Inventing the Barbarian*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- (1993), "Asia Unmanned: Images of Victory in Classical Athens," in *War and Society in the Greek World*, J. Rich, and G. Shipley, eds., London, 108-133.
- (1996), "When is a Myth Not a Myth?: Bernal's Ancient Model" in *Black Athena Revisited*, M. R. Lefkowitz, and G. M. Rogers, eds., Chapel Hill and London, 333-348.
- Hansen, M. H. (1991), *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*, Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.
- Herodotus, *The Histories*, translated by Aubrey de Sélincourt and revised by A. R. Burn, Harmondsworth, 1982.
- Hesiod, *The Works and Days; Theogony; The Shield of Herakles*, translated by R. Lattimore, Ann Arbor, 1991.
- Himmelfmann, N. (1971), *Archäologisches zum Problem der griechischen Sklaverei, (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1971, Nr. 13)*.
- Hippocrates, with an English translation by W. H. S. Jones, Volume I, Cambridge and London, Loeb Classical Library, 1922.
- Hirsch, S. W. (1985), *The Friendship of the Barbarians: Xenophon and the Persian Empire*, Hanover and London.
- Hofstetter, J. (1979), *Die Griechen in Persien: Prosopographie der griechen im persischen Reich vor Alexander*, Berlin, AM Iran Ergänzungsband 5.
- Holst-Warhaft, G. (1992), *Dangerous Voices: Women's Laments and Greek Literature*, London and New York.
- Hundt, H.-J. (1969), "Über vorgeschichtliche Seidenfunde," *Jahrbuch des römisch-germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz* 16, 59-72.
- Isocrates, with an English translation by G. Norlin, Volume I, London and New York, Loeb Classical Library, 1928.
- Jacoby, F. (1923), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, I, Berlin.
- Jeffery, L. (1976), *Archae Greece*, New York.
- Knigge, U. (1991), *The Athenian Kerameikos*, Krene.
- Kolchlin, P. (1993), *American Slavery*, London, New York, etc.

- Kolendo, J. (1979), "Elements pour une enquête sur l'iconographie des esclaves dans l'art hellénistique et romain," *Schavitu, manomissime e classi dipendenti nel Mondo Antico* (Università degli Studi di Padova, Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Storia Antica, Vol. XIII), 161-174.
- Laurens, A.-F. (1986), "Bousiris," in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Zurich and Munich, Artemis, III, 1, 147-152.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. (1996), "Ancient History, Modern Myths," in *Black Athena Revisited*, M. R. Lefkowitz, and G. M. Rogers, eds., Chapel Hill and London, 3-23.
- Lefkowitz, M. R., and M. B. Fant (1982), *Women's Life in Greece and Rome*, London and Baltimore.
- Lewis, D. M. (1977), *Sparta and Persia*, Leiden.
- Lloyd, A. B. (1975-1988), *Herodotus Book II*, Leiden.
- Long, T. (1986), *Barbarians in Greek Comedy*, Carbondale and Edwardsville, Ill.
- Mackie, H. S. (1996), *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad*, Lanham, Md.
- Meiggs, R. (1982), *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Oxford.
- Meiggs, R., and D. Lewis, (1969), *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford.
- Meijer, F., and O. van Nijf (1992), *Trade, Transport and Society in the Ancient World*, London and New York.
- Menander, *The Principal Fragments*, with an English translation by F. G. Allinson, London and New York, Loeb Classical Library, 1921.
- Metzger, B. M., and R. E. Murphy, (1991), *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*, New York.
- Momigliano, A. (1975), *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization*, Cambridge.
- Mosley, D. J. (1971), "Greeks, Barbarians, Language, and Contact," *Ancient Society* 2, 1-6.
- Munson, R. V. (1988), "Artemisia in Herodotus," *Classical Antiquity* 7, 91-106.
- Page, D. L. (1974), *Supplementum lyricis Graecis*, Oxford.
- Parke, H. W. (1933), *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*, Oxford.
- Pausanias, *Guide to Greece*, translated by Peter Levi, Penguin Books, 1979.
- Payne, H., and G. Mackworth-Young, (1950), *Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis*, London.
- Pedley, J. G. (1972), *Ancient Literary Sources on Sardis*, Archaeological Exploration of Sardis Monograph 2, Cambridge.
- Plato, *Collected Dialogues*, edited by E. Hamilton, and H. Cairns [various translators], Princeton, 1969.
- Plutarch, *On the Malice of Herodotus in Moralia*, with an English translation by L. Pearson, and F. H. Sandbach, Volume XI, Cambridge and London, Loeb Classical Library, 1970.
- Pritchard, J. B. (1950), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton.
- Rachels, J. (1993), *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*, New York, etc.
- Ridgway, B. S., 1977, *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*, Princeton.
- Rihll, T. (1993), "War, Slavery, and Settlement in Early Greece," in *War and Society in the Greek World*, J. Rich, and G. Shipley, eds., London, 77-107.
- Roberts, J. T. (1994), *Athens on Trial: The Antidemocratic Tradition in Western Thought*, Princeton.
- Roller, L. E. (1988), "The Legend of Midas," *Classical Antiquity* 2, 299-313.
- Romm, J. S., 1992, *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*, Princeton.
- Root, M. C. (1985), "The Parthenon Frieze and the Apadana Reliefs at Persepolis," *AJA* 89, 103-120.
- Rose, H. J. (1960), *A Handbook of Greek Literature*, New York.
- Ross, D. (1952), *The Works of Aristotle*, Vol. XII, Select Fragments, Oxford.
- Said, E. W. (1979), *Orientalism*, New York.
- Schoppa, H. (1933), *Die Darstellungen der Perser in der griechischen Kunst bis zum Beginn des Hellenismus*, Coburg.
- Snowden, F. (1970), *Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Stern, S. M. (1968), *Aristotle on the World State*, Columbia, S.C.
- Strabo, *The Geography*, with an English translation by H. L. Jones, London and New York, 8 volumes, Loeb Classical Library, 1917-1942.

- Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, translated by R. Warner, Penguin Books, 1972.
- Tyrrell, W. B. (1984), *Amazons: A Study in Athenian Mythmaking*, Baltimore.
- Vos, M. F. (1963), *Scythian Archers in Archaic Attic Vase-Painting*, Groningen.
- Von Bothmer, D. (1957), *Amazons in Greek Art*, Oxford.
- Walbank, F. W. (1993), *The Hellenistic World*, Cambridge.
- Walvin, J. (1983), *Slavery and the Slave Trade: A Short Illustrated History*, Jackson, Miss.
- West, M. L. (1988), "The Rise of the Greek Epic," *JHS* 108, 151-172.
- (1989), *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, I, Oxford.
- (1992), *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford.
- Wiedemann, T. (1988), *Greek and Roman Slavery*, London.
- Xenophon, *Hellenika*, with an English translation by C. L. Brownson, 1918, 1920; *Memorabilia and Oeconomicus*, with an English translation by E. C. Marchant, 1923; *Ways and Means*, in *Scripta Minora*, with an English translation by E. C. Marchant, 1925 (all London and New York, Loeb Classical Library).
- Young, T. C. (1988), "The Persian Empire," in *Cambridge Ancient History* IV, Part I, 1-111.